Marxism Today

heoretical and Discussion Journal of the Communist Party January 1975 25 pence

eorges Marchais speaks at Party Congress

Editorial Comments

Georges Marchais

Report to the 21st (Extraordinary) Congress of the French Communist Party (Part I)

Alvaro Cunhal

Report to the Extraordinary Party Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party

Alvaro Cunhal speaks at a Memorial Meeting

Discussion

Tom Bell
Richard Gunn

Trends in Youth Culture
Theory & Practice in Marxist Philosophy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Theoretical and Discussion Journal of the Communist Party

Volume 19, Number 1

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board
Irene Brennan/Gabriel Carritt/Tony Chater
Jack Cohen/Maurice Cornforth/Maurice Dobb
John Foster/John Gollan/Arnold Kettle
John Mahon/Betty Matthews/Allan Morton
Bert Pearce/Mike Seifert/George Wake
Nick Wright

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann, 16 King Street, WC2E 8HY

Advertisements
Doris Allison, above address

Orders and Subscriptions
Usual Agents or Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8PS

Subscription Rates £3.75 per annum

CONTENTS

	Editorial Comments	1
George Marchais	Report to the Twenty First (Extraordinary) Congress of the French Communist Party	5
Alvaro Cunhal	Report to the Extraordinary Party Congress	12
Discussion:		
Tom Bell	Trends in Youth Culture	22
Richard Gunn	Theory and Practice in Marxist Philosophy	25

The front cover was designed by Pat Cook and the photographs supplied by the *Morning Star*

SOME ARTICLES PLANNED FOR FEBRUARY-APRIL 1975

E. A. Bitsakis	Relativism and Relativity
Donald Cameron	Problems of Heredity
Bill Carr	Memories of the General Strike
Frank Chane	Systems Thinking
Ruth & Edmund Frow	The First International and the Manchester Working Class
Steve Iliffe	Health Care and the Medical Profession
Martin Jacques	Trends in Youth Culture: Reply to Discussion
James Klugmann	Strategy of the Democratic Anti-Monopoly Revolution
Peter Latham	Relations between Marxist and non-Marxist Sociology
Jack Lindsay	The Role of the Individual in Art
Georges Marchais	Report to the 21st Congress of the French Communist Party (continued)
George Matthews	Post-Election Perspectives
Giorgio Napolitano	Party, Working Class and Intellectuals
Barrie Stacey	The Marxist View of Human Nature
Ray Volleamere	Karl Marx: Activity and Alienation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

THE recent post-election Conference of the Labour Party revealed the sharpening of the conflict between the Left and Right trends in the party.

The left scored a number of important successes—critique of Government policy towards South Africa and support for the three Cabinet Ministers attacked by Wilson in this connection; a unanimous resolution opposing Government financial policy towards the Chilean Fascist Junta; a resolution calling for the release of the Shrewsbury Two; and especially a big victory on the Common Market. The Right Wing, however, were successful in defeating resolutions critical of Healey's Budget and, despite a reduction in their votes, maintaining their position on the Labour Party Executive.

They used the Conference to wage massive propaganda for the "social contract" as the guaranteed and only cure for inflation and unemployment as the central pillar of their whole economic policy. Again and again, Wilson, Callaghan and Healey raised the spectre of unemployment if wage demands were not restrained. These statements were all linked with others declaring "there can be no real increase in the average standard of life for some time to come. Maintain the standards, yes; improve them no." (Callaghan). Healey went one better . . . "the great majority of us have got to give up any hope of improvement in our living standards *for the next few years*" (our italics).

All this is in absolute contradiction to the pledge in Labour's Election Manifesto to bring about a "massive redistribution of wealth". More, "maintenance" of existing standards depends on whether wage increases won to keep pace with the increased cost of living are before or after tax. If before, then workers' wages would lag permanently behind prices.

Despite the vote on the Common Market, Schmidt, the West German Chancellor and fraternal delegate from the West German Social Democratic Party, made a cunning intervention into the Common Market debate in direct opposition to the Conference decision on this matter. He played on the theme of "international socialist solidarity": "Your comrades on the Continent want you in", he said. Into what? He forbore to mention that, according to the forecasts made by the Common Market Commission itself, unemployment throughout the Community could amount to four million by April, an increase of 30 per cent over present figures. Or that swingeing austerity measures are in operation in France. Or that it is anticipated that unemployment will rise to over the million mark in West Germany.

The movement should be on the alert for a "dirty tricks" operation to swing the referendum in favour of entry, by the Government producing short-term "concessions" and framing the questions in a way favouring support.

This is brought out by the following:— "If the eight other members of the Community . . . concede entry terms . . . which the Cabinet find acceptable they will expect the Cabinet to give them full public endorsement and not just . . . 'leave it to the public to decide'. . . . *They are likely to demand a commitment from Mr. Wilson to this effect in advance before any final agreement on new terms*". (*Sunday Times*, December 1. Our Italics).

A great united effort is therefore essential to see that the Conference resolution with the eight guidelines for re-negotiating terms, are adhered to.

A last word: What a furore there would have been from the media, from politicians and from all and sundry, if leaders of the Soviet Union or other Socialist countries had declared that there was no hope of improving living standards for years to come!

But there is a thunderous silence over economic advance in the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. The Secretary of Comecon (Council of Mutual Economic Aid) reported that the National Income of the member countries had increased by 11.6 per cent in the two years 1971-72. Recession, stagflation, the spectre of unemployment, are capitalist "luxuries", unknown in the Socialist world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW THREATS TO DEMOCRACY

The horror of the bombings in Birmingham on the night of November 21 should not be allowed to obscure the nature of the boost in police powers introduced by the Home Secretary Roy Jenkins.

The IRA has been made illegal and the police can now arrest without a warrant anyone reasonably suspected of being concerned in the commission, preparation, or instigation of acts of terrorism.

The police have been given power to detain without charge for 48 hours and for five more days with the consent of the Home Secretary. They can fingerprint a person arrested under the new powers even though he is not charged. The Home Secretary can make exclusion orders to keep people out of Britain and to expel those already here—even to Northern Ireland, another part of the United Kingdom.

He had promised before we went to press that the demand for the death penalty for convictions under the new laws would be debated in the House of Commons in the reasonably near future and has made clear that the introduction of an Identity Card system has not been ruled out as a possible future measure. In a tense situation the new measures have secured wide support. But their deeper consequences have to be weighed.

In the first place they will not deal with the problem.

In Northern Ireland the IRA is banned and powers under the Emergency Provisions Act, 1973 to detain without charge, intern without trial and hold trial without jury have only made the situation worse. And it is from there the terrorism springs.

Secondly it is known that the Home Secretary's advisers have been against banning the IRA, and the police have admitted they already had sufficiently wide powers.

Although terrorism must be utterly repudiated and combatted, measures against it should not undermine the legitimate activities of the working class and the rights of innocent citizens.

The measures introduced are a serious erosion of our civil liberties in the context of the general attacks on democratic rights and the build up of the powers of the police and the army in Britain in the past few years.

Combined police and army manoeuvres at Heathrow airport have now been extended to Gatwick. With the support of right-wing Tory and fascist groups the army has in many respects become a law unto itself in Northern Ireland and has prepared contingency plans to operate here.

The new laws could result in massive harassment of the Irish community in Britain as well as of anyone working for a solution based on the eventual re-unification of Ireland. Their effects on the deep feelings of Irish nationalism among Irish people generally could be very serious.

What is needed are measures to redress the real grievances of the people in Northern Ireland. Unless this is done the continuing consequences for the people of all parts of the United Kingdom will seriously worsen.

We all have a duty to work to secure a reversal of the Westminster government's policy of repression in Northern Ireland and its replacement by reform. Internment, which has only increased terrorism, should be ended and the troops withdrawn to barracks as a first step towards their complete withdrawal.

Constitutional reform must be sought including a Bill of Rights, safeguards against religious and political discrimination and the repeal of the Emergency Provisions Act. Such reform should be aimed at reconciliation of estranged communities and ultimately to unity of the Irish working class and people.

It is to be hoped the TUC and Labour Party will use their strength to this end.

THE TRANSITION TO NEP

To supplement an advance notice of Laszlo Szamuely's "First Models of the Socialist Economic Systems, Principles and Theories" which appeared in *Marxism Today* for March 1974, Page 67, one may now say that the English translation of this has appeared, from the Academy publishing house in Budapest (Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1974 pp. 109, £2.60). In many ways a unique book, its contents are essentially historical, but concerned with *interpretation* rather than with the events themselves. It consists of four chapters only, which are respectively entitled "Salient features of the economic system of War Communism", "The Ideology of War Communism", "Lenin and the transition to NEP", "Transition to NEP and the theoretical revision".

Its freshness and original slant are best conveyed by the following passage from the author's Introduction:—

> "The clarification of a problem of much broader relevance depends on the answer (to these questions):

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

namely, which of the functional models of socialist economy was theoretically and practically the initial pattern of the socialist socio-economic system: a centralised subsistence economy, based on egalitarian principles, or a regulated market system, relying on material incentives?

"If this problem can be sufficiently clarified, the substance of NEP will also appear in a different light, and the mode of transition to it will immediately turn from a problem of party history into one of the history of economic thought."

The notion that socialism must be essentially "natural economy", in substitution for "commodity production", he traces back before Bukharin of 1920 to Kautsky and the Erfurt Programme of 1891.

CLASS AND SOCIETY IN THE USSR

"*Les Soviétiques: Classes et Société en URSS*" by Francis Cohen (Editions Sociales, Paris) is an extraordinarily readable French book describing the composition of Soviet society today. It gives quite a full but brief history of the evolution of Soviet society from the revolutions of 1917 to this day, cautiously taking in the big structural reforms which began in the late 1960s.

Following the historical introduction, the title of the two other parts of the book are "The social classes of developed socialism" and "social evolution and democracy". The volume's 350 pages deal in detail with the composition (by employment, sex and according to town and village balances) of the population today. The whole is set against a background of experimentation, changes and problems to be solved. And Francis Cohen does not avoid discussing the difficulties encountered in the course of building an advanced and highly educated new society without capitalists.

The introduction states: "The intent of this book is firstly, to understand the big problems faced by the Soviet Union as they are seen by the Soviet people themselves. One is condemned to incomprehension if one tries to judge them from the standpoint of great abstract principles alone, or if one superimposes on Soviet reality questions which our own society poses for us."

The book puts forward a closely argued case for rejecting any picture of Soviet society as top-heavy with overpaid administrators, and he states that the difference in pay between the lowest paid worker and the highest paid factory manager has considerably diminished since 1959 and is smaller than it was in 1922.

For the British reader who might still have many illusions about the cultural level of the Soviet worker, we quote a revealing paragraph:

"On average, the Soviet town worker spends 70 per cent of his free time on his training and intellectual activities. He spends 16 hours a week on education, over an hour on non-professional (do-it-yourself) work, more than four hours looking after his children, over two hours on sport and PT, 13 hours on rest and entertainment."

"SCREEN"

The Summer 1974 issue of *Screen* (vol. 15 no. 2) is a special issue on Bertolt Brecht and the cinema. As well as a number of articles on *Kuhle Wampe*, the film which Brecht scripted and which was made in Germany in 1931 by a team including himself, the film director Slatan Dudow and the composer Hanns Eisler, with the assistance of the German Communist Party and the Workers' Sports movement, the issue attempts to deal with the problems raised by Brecht's notions of didactic art and the alienation-effect for any attempt at a revolutionary intervention in the cinema. Brecht's example suggests the possibility of challenging the dominant aesthetic canons without, like the avant-garde, reducing the audience to a tiny elite. In short, the issue tries to investigate the relations between progressive and popular cinema.

This concern is not confined to this one issue of *Screen*. *Screen* is the theoretical magazine of the Society for Education in Film and Television. The SEFT is an organi-

Please post MARXISM TODAY to me every month.

I enclose:

£3.75 for one year

(U.K. and abroad)

Name .....

Address .....

.....

.....

Post with remittance to:

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.

37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8PS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sation of teachers in schools and institutions of higher education which have included film studies in their curricula in some form. Film is new to the education system. The SEFT fears that the place film studies may find in the curriculum will be modelled on that of English literature in one of the dominant forms of teaching literary studies: that the students will be taught to discriminate the good from the bad by a criterion which is not rationally disputable because it rests on the joint experience of the work by teacher and student, interpreted by the teacher.

This model in fact discriminates not between good and bad works but between good and bad students, the elect and the rest. Hitherto film has in the main escaped the model because it was a mass entertainment, not an art. But most of the approaches to film studies that have been proposed are only too easily accommodated to it. The SEFT therefore set its magazine *Screen* the task of exploring the establishment of a theory of film which was available to rational discussion and was not prejudiced against film's qualities as a mass entertainment medium. A second journal, *Screen Education*, has been established to deal with more directly educational problems. Thus the special issue of *Screen* on Brecht is part of a continuing strategy of the SEFT. All those teaching film studies or wishing to do so are urged to join the Society, and all those interested in film theory to read *Screen*.[1]

MOZAMBIQUE CHRISTIANS IN FRELIMO

The new monthly magazine of the World Council of Churches—*One World*—has published a moving interview with two Mozambique Christians.[2]

The journal's representative met with Pastor Isaias Funzano, President of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in Mozambique, who a year ago was in prison in Laurenco Marques, and Pastor Casimir Matié, the Synodal Secretary.

The *One World* representative asked for their reaction to the Portuguese events of last April. Pastor Matié replied:

> "We are very happy about what happened. The first fruits of the April events for us were the disappearance of the political police, Pide, and the possibility of giving open support to FRELIMO, the popular front for the liberation of Mozambique."

Pastor Funzano discussed the attitude of the Mozambique Presbyterian Church to FRELIMO:

> "The Presbyterian Church has always put emphasis on education. Many of the students in our 25 schools left to join FRELIMO. (Indeed the first President of FRELIMO, Eduardo Mondlane, was a member of our Church.) They saw this commitment as part of their evangelical task and that's why Pide took a special interest in our church.
>
> "When you are in that situation you can't be told just fold your arms and wait for a solution to fall from the skies. One must act. Our struggle inside Mozambique was based on the fact that we hoped churches outside would fight for us and that God would use them to help us."

The policy of FRELIMO, Pastor Funzano said was multi-racial and anti-racist. White people who wished to live in Mozambique would be able to do so:

> "Mozambicans are very tolerant and patient towards Europeans, despite all they have suffered. Those Europeans who are leaving us at the moment are those who have lead consciences about what they did in our country, and it is better that they leave. But those who are simply afraid of change will probably return and we will welcome them."

GRAMSCI AS A JOURNALIST

The publishing house *Editori Riuniti* at Rome have just published a new collection of the writings of Antonio Gramsci under the title of "For Truth" (Per la Verita). It will contain 115 articles—some previously unknown—which have been for the first time attributed to Gramsci. Most of them appeared in the Socialist and Communist press between 1913-1926. The collection is edited by Renzo Martelli.

CORRECTION

In the December 1974 issue of *Marxism Today* we gave the name of the author of an article on "Trends in Youth Culture" as *Ivor* Mills. The name should be *Albert* Mills. Editorial apologies.

[1] (Membership of the SEFT, including subscriptions to *Screen* and *Screen Education*—four issues each per annum—£3.50 to SEFT, 63 Old Compton Street, London W1, 'phone 01-734 5455.)

[2] *One World*, No. 1 (November 1974), Communications Department of the WCC, 150 Route de Ferney, P.O. Box 66, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report to the Twenty First (Extraordinary) Congress of the French Communist Party

Georges Marchais
General Secretary of the CPF

We are publishing extracts from the four-hour central committee report delivered by Georges Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party, at the party's 21st (extraordinary) Congress held at Vitry-sur-Seine from October 24 to 27, 1974. Part I of the report—which we do not publish—deals with the present political and economic situation in France and the development of left unity over recent years to the point of almost defeating the right in the presidential election of last May. Parts II and III appear below. Part IV, discussing the meaning and purpose of the "union of the French people" that it is now the objective of the French Communist Party to achieve, will appear in the February Marxism Today. *Extracts translated by Peter Avis.*

PART II

THE CONTINUATION OF OUR CORRECT POLITICAL STRATEGY

It is quite clear that the regime is showing in every field its fundamental inability to resolve the problems of our time. The deep crisis that the country is facing, the development of the popular movement and the international situation all call for a real and complete change in political direction.

This situation confirms in a striking way the correctness of our political analysis and of our political strategy.

The pre-congress discussion dealt extensively with this question. Some comrades asked whether we were not renouncing the struggle for socialism, whereas some others argued that now was not the time to campaign on this issue. Both were mistaken. Let us examine the problem in detail.

It is Socialism that We are Fighting for

As we know, the great struggles of May-June 1968 led us, in the wake of our 17th and 18th congresses, to define our strategy in the Manifesto "For an Advanced Democracy, for a Socialist France," that was adopted at Champigny at the end of the same year.

The great class battles of 1968 demonstrated the inability of the big business system to resolve the increasingly sharp economic and social contradictions that the system engenders.

They constituted the first great confrontation between the working masses and monopoly power.

Further, through the satisfaction of immediate demands that could no longer be put off, the movement was seeking more fundamental and decisive changes in the society in which we live. As the Manifesto observed: "The desire to achieve a more just, rational and humane organisation of society has greatly developed over recent years among all working sections of society. New social groups are coming to the side of the working class in the class struggle to attack not only the symptoms but also the causes of the evils of capitalist domination. This desire will pave the way to a real struggle for socialism."

Socialism, indeed, is the economic and social system that finally abolishes the exploitation of man and puts production to the service of the betterment of all members of society and the free development of each individual. It is for this truly new society, for socialism, that we are fighting. There can be no ambiguity about this at all. The more so when all can see that socialist ideas are advancing in our country as they are throughout the world.

Our task is to win the majority of our people over to socialist ideas and to the struggle for socialism.

And, as the Manifesto stressed: "One cannot do that except by showing to the people that it is possible in the first place to get rid of the present anti-democratic regime and by convincing them that there must be a fundamental transformation of the economic and social structure."

Our Road to Socialism

Monopoly capitalism is the dominant form of capitalism in a country like ours at this time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, it is characterised by a close link between the monopolies and the state, the latter being essentially at the service of the former. Destroying the absolute power of the monopolies, breaking their hold over the state, is therefore the immediate requirement. It is an indispensable stage of our struggle to win over the popular masses to the idea and the practice of the eventual socialist transformation of society.

This then is our conception, our strategy.

It is based above all on the fact that the system of state monopoly capitalism—as I recalled just now—has thrown society into a global crisis, meaning that things can no longer remain as they are, that a fundamental transformation of the social structure is objectively necessary.

It is based on the realisation that there is an ever growing community of interests between all the social groups that are victims of the monopolies and their policy, and that it is increasingly possible for them to unite around the working class.

It is based on the evolution on an international scale of a balance of forces favourable to peace, detente and socialism, and on the fact that there has therefore never been such an opportunity for each people to choose its own destiny.

It is a realist strategy. It constitutes the best way in the conditions of our country and of our time of building a powerful popular movement, sufficiently *broad* and sufficiently *determined* to open the way to socialism. Such a movement is indispensable for the socialist transformation of society, whatever forms that society may take.

For, as we well know, the exploiting class does not and never will willingly give up its privileges and its domination. In order to maintain this domination it will always tend to use the means at its disposal. Only a balance of political forces favourable to the working class, to the people, can overcome this. Our strategy is designed precisely to create this condition. Thus the events that took place in Chile, far from calling this strategy into question, only substantiate its correctness.

As we said before the Central Committee in December 1973:

> "Our road to socialism is a democratic road. It is not the road of illusions, but takes into account national and international realities. It is not the road of renunciation but of confidence in the possibilities of developing the combative spirit of our people. It is not the road of narrow electoralism, but that of the struggle of the workers, of the broad popular masses, to guarantee respect for the will expressed through universal suffrage. It is not the road of adventurism but that of systematic and resolute action for the satisfaction of the material and intellectual needs of all who are opposed by big business."

Our party has always been concerned to take careful account of reality in this way.

As early as 1946, Maurice Thorez put forward the idea that the way to socialism in France would follow its own path. He declared:

> "The progress of democracy throughout the world, despite rare exceptions that confirm the rule, allow us to envisage a way to socialism by other paths than those taken by the Russian Communists. In any case the road is of necessity different for each country. We have always thought and declared that the people of France, who are rich in a glorious tradition, would find their own road towards greater democracy, progress and social justice."

In the same spirit, basing ourselves on the lessons of 1968, on the Champigny Manifesto and on present reality, we have defined in "The Democratic Challenge" our conception of socialism for France.

Socialism in the Colours of France

It would certainly not be possible to describe in advance all the features of a socialist France. Its image will be determined above all by the democratic history and traditions of our country, but also by its level of development and the state of its economy at the time it undertakes this transformation, as well as by the balance of social and political forces, and by the degree of consciousness of the masses.

However, in order to raise the battle of ideas in favour of socialism to the necessary level, our party should define without delay its conception of the socialist France of tomorrow. Let us recall briefly what this conception is.

In the first place, for France as for every other country, socialism to begin with entails the common ownership of the principal means of production and exchange.

In this respect, our opponents accuse us of wishing to instal "naked collectivism". They are trying to suggest that we would seek, by imposing a barracks society, to crush and destroy the individual and the family. But today, it is their system and their policy that is leading to this result.

The formula "tube-job-bed" was not invented on the banks of the Moskva but on the banks of the Seine. In its way it describes how the individual and family life suffer from inhuman living and working conditions that are always contrived to answer the needs of profit, not of people. Was it not Mr. Chirac who recently had a law passed restricting the use of heating in private flats as well as in public buildings?

Was it not Mr. Giscard d'Estaing who, no doubt considering that national economic plans are drawn up too openly, recently created a cen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tral planning council, whereby a small committee is entrusted with deciding questions concerning employment, wages and savings, crucial aspects of daily life for every citizen?

The power of the financial aristocracy is the worst "collectivism" that can be imagined: wage earners work *collectively* for the profit of feudal-like bankers and industrialists, who *collectively* organise this exploitation and *collectively* pillage the national wealth!

Besides—and this ought to make the inventors of anti-Communist slogans more prudent—there exists an objective tendency towards socialisation. This is one of the characteristics of our time.

Modern production requires ever greater co-operation. Consider, for example, the number of manual and clerical workers, technicians, engineers and managers that are needed today to invent, develop and manufacture a car whose many parts are products of different industries.

Modern life cannot be conceived without the development of public services in education, transport, housing, health, leisure, culture and sport.

The Necessity of Planning

All this has to be organised in a coherent manner. We have to see that industry produces what is necessary today and that it will be able to produce tomorrow in accordance with the needs of people and society. It is necessary to channel investment, whether short, medium or long-term, and to forecast changing manpower requirements.

In short, planning is a necessity nowadays.

What is described as planning in France today is an attempt to organise economic development in the interests of the big capitalist monopolies.

Capitalist society thus reflects in its own way the need to control and give a coherent direction to the economy. But real planning, such as would correspond to the needs of our time, cannot be achieved by capitalism. *For, if work is collective, property and the management of the economy are private.* It is a requirement of our time to put an end to this situation.

Socialisation of the principal means of production and exchange will fulfil this requirement in allowing genuine democratic planning in the service of people and of society, in the service of development and of national greatness.

At the same time, this planning must be accompanied by decentralised management of the economy and democratic control of industries which will themselves enjoy a large degree of autonomy.

Democratic planning is inseparable from autonomous and decentralised management of production units. Both correspond to the needs of a modern economy.

In another respect, one of the characteristics of building socialism in our country will without any doubt be that it will be done with the maintenance of a considerable number of small businesses in industry, commerce and craft enterprises, for collectivisation is neither necessary to the country nor is it desirable.

What is more, we have no intention of expropriating and collectivising the hundreds of thousands of family holdings in agriculture. It needs to be pointed out that today these are gravely threatened not by "collectivism" but by the policy of the big bourgeoisie.

We do not want for France a society in which technocrats will decide everything instead of the French people and their elected representatives. We want a society in which the workers the citizens will be called upon increasingly to take control of their own affairs at every level of national life.

Exercise of Power by the Working People

The second characteristic of socialism—which is also a condition of the development of democracy—is the exercise of power by the working class, by the working people ("par la classe ouvrière, par les travailleurs").

We should consider what it means in France, that is to say in a country in which wage earners constitute 80 per cent of the working population, to speak of "the exercise of power by the working class, by the working people". It means that power will be in the hands of the great majority of the French people.

Naturally, in this situation, the working class will fulfil its leading role when once it assumes its rightful place and responsibilities in the life of the nation, and when the key sectors of the economy are put under the management of the workers within the framework of a democratically drawn up plan.

This will mean as never before a blooming of democracy and liberties, promoting the harmonious reconciliation of community and national interests with individual aspirations.

Great struggles for liberty and democracy mark the history of our country. The workers, the popular masses, are rightly attached to the democratic gains that these struggles of preceding generations have wrested from the exploiting classes. Socialism will preserve and develop a democratic patrimony peculiar to our country.

Socialist Democracy

For example, we say that in a socialist France it will be possible to have several democratic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties sharing power. It will also be possible to have opposition parties.

The full economic and political democracy developed in this way will make it possible to improve as never before the material well-being of each and every one, within a framework of genuine social justice. This has no connection with primitive egalitarianism. Without any doubt we should get rid of a disparity of incomes so extreme that in our country today a few thousand privileged wealthy people each receive on average 800 times more than the average earnings of the millions of workers on the legal minimum wage. This development will not be aimed at suppressing all differentials but at establishing them on a just basis, giving them a proper structure, and doing this in the context of substantially increasing the incomes of those at the bottom of the earnings scale.

Access to Knowledge and Culture

Lastly, the socialism that we want will be characterised by giving the broad mass of the people the freest access to knowledge and to the appreciation and practice of all forms of art and culture. This is an essential objective, for socialism has no meaning unless it makes available to each worker, each person, the means of controlling his or her life.

A happy and free people in an independent, prosperous and strong France is not utopia. It is something that the French people can achieve if they unite to build socialism in the colours of France.

That also is a requirement of our time.

One need only examine the perspectives opened to humanity by the beginnings of the scientific and technical revolution. It is evident that the exploitation of man by man belongs to a past age. The future, on the other hand, belongs to co-operation between qualified and responsible people, both within industry and outside it. The future means a society that sets itself the goal, not of profit for the few, but of satisfaction of the needs of all.

This is something that capitalism cannot provide.

Socialism, on the other hand, will take our people and our country a decisive step along this road. Because it means—as our Champigny Manifesto pointed out—"at the same time the common ownership of the principal means of production and exchange, the exercise of political power by the working class and its allies, the progressive satisfaction of the ever growing material and intellectual needs of the members of society, the creation of conditions bringing about the flowering of each personality."

The Common Programme and Socialism

The desire to bring nearer the hour of socialism for France then inspires all the activity of our party. We have in no way renounced this aim in adopting a common programme that provides for fundamental democratic reforms. Quite the opposite, as our comrade Waldeck Rochet wrote:

> "In fighting today for the extension of democracy in the political and economic field, in fighting to limit the power of the monopolies and in seeking to develop unity in action of all working-class and democratic forces, we are fulfilling the task of revolutionaries."

In the same spirit, we wrote in the preface to the book published by our party presenting the Common Programme:

> "The Programme clearly defines a policy which if it is resolutely implemented, will establish an advanced democracy that can open the way to socialism, in the forms and with the characteristics appropriate to our country."

Does this mean, as our opponents maintain, that the successful implementation of the Common Programme would lead fatally to some kind of straitjacket system? No, there is no automatism in the perspective that we propose. And this for a fundamental reason that I have mentioned just now: the construction of socialism can be undertaken only on the basis of a balance of social and political forces that is favourable to the people; it can be the result only of the struggle of the people, of their freely expressed majority choice. When the time comes, it will be for the people of our country, learning from experience and as a result of our own activity, who will decide. We have said that we shall respect the people's verdict and this we shall do.

This being so, the task of our party is to continue its parallel efforts to popularise and win support both for the proposals of the Common Programme and for the party's conception of socialism for France.

On the occasion of the Central Committee meeting held immediately after the presidential election, we called on the whole party to pursue this double task more effectively while avoiding especially the constant repetition of stereotyped formulas valid for all times and all places.

We added: "It is necessary to realise that this is an exceptionally difficult campaign to conduct. It calls for great perception, conviction and political intelligence."

If one considers the path followed since 1968, everything shows that our strategy is a part of life. Therefore there is certainly no question of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changing it! On the contrary, we must apply it by developing our policy and activity, on the basis of results already acquired, to meet the needs of the new situation.

This is what we are doing in making our objective: the union of the French people for democratic change.

PART III
FUNDAMENTAL DEMOCRATIC REFORMS

Democratic change, what does this mean?

It means the replacement of the present policy of social regression, economic stagnation, increased authoritarianism and national surrender by a new policy of social, democratic and national progress. It means a policy to take France out of the crisis.

Such a change is possible only by the implementation of fundamental democratic reforms, breaking the domination of big business. This is why the Common Programme provides for such reforms: they are its essential characteristic.

An anti-monopolist programme, a programme to democratise economic and social life, it is limited in the sense that it is not a programme for the establishment of socialism. When we state this, it is not at all a matter of giving "reassurances". We are simply concerned not to confuse people: to liken the Common Programme to socialism would be to diminish and dull the idea of socialism and its revolutionary content.

But, because the democratisation provided for in the Common Programme will go beyond what our country has ever experienced, we have described this political change as being to an "advanced democracy".

No Real Change without Fundamental Democratic Reforms

There will be no change without these reforms. To substantiate this argument, let us take, for example, the question of energy and in particular the oil problem.

The government makes out that increases in the price of oil products from the producer countries has inevitably negative consequences for the French economy. We have shown that this is not so.

Between the producer and the consumer countries, middlemen are making scandalous profits: these middlemen are the big oil companies joined together in a cartel and directly or indirectly controlling our country's supplies.

Thus, in 1973, Shell-France profits trebled while Esso-France and BP-France profits doubled!

The big oil trusts are holding France to ransom. And the companies in which the state has an interest, such as the Compagnie Francaise des Pétroles, owe allegiance to the cartel of big foreign companies and help in different ways to organise its domination.

To gratify the international oil magnates coal production has been reduced in France. To gratify the big multinational trusts in the nuclear energy industry—among which some are tied to the oil cartel—the independent development of research and production in this industry has been largely abandoned in our country.

Also, in November 1973, after the producer countries had raised their prices and the big companies organised their blackmail of scarcity, the French government succumbed to their demands.

It is the French people who have paid. The big trusts have made profit out of this in a scandalous way. The net profits of the 30 American oil companies have, for example, increased by 93 per cent in the six months following the price rise.

Today, when the cartel of oil magnates is preparing a similar operation, the government can find no other solution than rationing.

The only means to solve the problem in a positive way for the French people—that is to say, without rationing and without escalating price rises—is to free our country from the control of the oil cartel, by creating and developing a public sector in energy that would in particular allow the negotiation and application of stable and reciprocally advantageous agreements with the producer countries.

To this end, we call for the nationalisation of the Compagnie Francaise des Pétroles.

One could quote many other examples covering all the questions that concern the French people. Whether it be a matter of prices, employment, town planning, education, research, culture, leisure . . . in all these fields, without any exception, the obstacle that has to be removed before genuine changes can be brought about, is the domination of the big capitalist monopolies.

That is why the Common Programme provides for the nationalisation of the banking and financial sector, and of nine of the principal capitalist monopolies, and for a majority holding by the state in four other big companies.

Nationalisations to the Benefit of the Workers and in the National Interest

By breaking the domination of big business, the nationalisations that we propose will allow us to promote a new kind of economic policy, for the benefit of the workers and in the national interest. This is the indispensable basis for the full implementation of all the democratic reforms recommended in the Common Programme.

This will allow for planning that will be both modern and democratic. And it will make it pos-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sible to develop the key sectors of national life, creating more stable economic conditions which will help the small producers of town and country along with commerce in general.

This economic policy will give a new impetus to the national economy. It will create conditions for effective and durable solutions to the problems that beset France.

For example: it will be possible to fight inflation successfully by attacking its causes, which are the vast accumulation of profits and the wastage of the country's resources. Credit control will channel these resources, no longer into unproductive and parasitic sectors, but into uses that answer the people's needs.

For example: it will become possible to ensure for our country the growth to meet the requirements of national and social progress. The nationalisations will likewise contribute to raising the moral standards of economic life....

These nationalisations will have to be accompanied by real measures of democratisation. In public sector industries, management will be decentralised, autonomous and based on the effective participation of the employees in all decisions affecting the life and development of their works. And beyond that, it will be necessary in all sectors to extend trade union rights and the prerogatives of works councils.

Democratic nationalisations constitute a vital pillar of the Common Programme. In our time and in our country all other genuine reforms depend upon them.

Democratisation at all Levels

Another essential aspect of the Common Programme is its provision for the greatest extension of democratic life. This is a fundamental question for us.

Indeed, the genuine democratic transformation of our society can be brought about only as the result of the conscious action of our people united to defeat the power of the big monopolies and their state.

We do not see the purpose of this unified force as simply to end the power of the financial aristocracy. The innovating policy required in the future can succeed only if it is constantly formulated and put into effect with the active participation of the French people.

This idea that it is necessary to extend democracy, which we see as a process of "continuous creation", is the basis of our whole approach.

That is why we attach so much importance to the proposals in the Common Programme designed to extend liberties.

I have already referred to democratic management in industry. The same concern will be given to democratising local life, in cities, towns and villages, and to democratising the state machinery. We must get rid of the personal and occult power that in no way meets the needs of people in our era.

Finally, as we know, the Common Programme provides for the respect and extension of all liberties, both individual and collective.

A Great Popular Social Policy

Structural reforms will give the means of putting a great popular social policy into effect, permitting workers and the French people as a whole to live better, to have a different way of life. Such is our objective.

Unlike the technocrats on all sides, we do not consider economic, social and political institutions in isolation from the rest of society. What guided us in drawing up our own party programme and the Common Programme was the desire to promote a policy in the service of the workers, of the whole people, of the country.

This is why we attach prime importance to the general line of social policy as defined in the first part of the Common Programme: giving people the opportunity to live better, to change their way of life.

For millions of workers and their families this means in the first place satisfying their most urgent needs.

In a developed country such as ours, it is unacceptable that people should find it so hard to lead a decent life.

Indeed, as we have pointed out, France is rich and possesses immense resources. Saved from pillage by the big capitalist companies, these resources can and will be used to the benefit of the workers, of our people.

It is a question of social justice. But today it is likewise a matter of economic necessity. A policy of social progress designed to balance in all fields the needs of employment, production, purchasing power and consumption, will in turn promote both economic development and the extension of democracy.

This is why, as we stress, there can be no true national policy without a policy of progress and social justice.

As our draft resolution points out, it is a question of ensuring increasing purchasing power for the workers, of reducing hardship and improving their working conditions, of undertaking effective policies in housing, transport, health, town planning and culture, that will begin to satisfy people's needs according to the requirements and possibilities of the modern age. This will be "a policy in the service of people".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All this affects the daily lives of millions of workers, of French people beset today by so many difficulties. In putting into effect a truly innovating policy, it is first of all the situation of these people that must be changed, and especially that of the most disadvantaged.

Thus it is, for example, that the social policy laid down by the Common Programme includes measures designed to improve the situation of unskilled workers, by increasing more rapidly their real wages, reducing work pressures, giving them health protection and job security, raising their qualifications and giving them the opportunity, if they so desire, of changing jobs. All this will create more humane working conditions. And they will continue to be improved as advances in production techniques are put to the service of people, contrary to what happens today when people are put to the service of the machine.

Thus also we must improve the situation of immigrant workers, who make an important contribution to economic development but who are today victims of shameless exploitation as well as of the evils of racism that affects especially the Algerian workers. With the implementation of the Common Programme, the equality of economic and social rights as well as of trade union and democratic rights, and respect for their human dignity and national cultures, will all be guaranteed.

A Policy of Independence, Cooperation and Peace

This kind of social policy is inseparable from a policy of national independence, cooperation and peace. This is another vital pillar of the Common Programme.

How are we to ensure increasing purchasing power for the workers if cartels of foreign trusts or supra-national authorities decide prices, dictate France's import and export policy?

How are we to guarantee employment if the survival or development of French enterprises is decided by international agreements that do not correspond to the real economic interests of the country?

More generally, how shall we bring about social and cultural progress if our country is not free to develop a variety of economic, cultural, scientific and tourist relations with other countries?

The workers, the French people, have a need for their country to regain its full freedom of initiative on the international plane so that it may follow an active policy in favour of detente and peaceful coexistence, of collective security and disarmament.

They have a need for France to undertake a broad policy of cooperation without discrimination, taking advantage of the possibilities in this respect offered by the socialist countries, and establishing new relations with the young independent states—relations that will be divested of neo-colonialist practices.

In setting out to construct a peaceful, democratic and independent Europe; in supporting the people of the Third World in struggle for their independence and their development, in giving real guaranteees to the peoples of the overseas territories so that they will be able to decide their own destinies and establish the type of government of their choice, France will again have the place in the world that is her due. She will renew many friendships and positive relationships.

Because the ability of a country to ensure fully its own national defence is an established element of its independence, the government of a democratic France will establish, as the Common Programme states, "a military strategy allowing it to face any possible aggressor whoever it may be." As the instrument of national defence, "the army will be given no task of maintaining order at home or of intervening in colonial or imperialist interests abroad." This excludes, in our view, any French participation in whatever attempt to create a new "European Defence Community".

Taking advantage of the development of world detente, a democratic France will work for disarmament, sign the international treaties on the limitation of armaments, renounce its own nuclear force, strictly control the sale of arms, and take many initiatives in favour of collective security and of universal, controlled general disarmament.

Such a policy will in itself be an important factor in national defence. This will be based moreover on a conscript army linked with the nation and its democratic life, provided with the necessary professional cadres and material means.

Thus, the reforms proposed by the Common Programme are fundamental, precise and coherent. They will establish a new policy that is the only positive response to the present crisis. These great objectives meet the most pressing needs of the workers and the country.

This is why we so strongly insist on them.

Having said this, we naturally do not consider every line of the text of the Common Programme as sacrosanct. As we have said, it must be brought up to date. It can be enriched.

The policy defined by the Common Programme has already won the support of 13 million French men and women.

It is certainly the solid basis on which we can build the union of the French people for democratic change. *(continued in next issue)*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report to the Extraordinary Communist Party Congress

Alvaro Cunhal

On Sunday, October 20, 1974, the Portuguese Communist Party held its 7th Congress—designated an Extraordinary Congress—the first legal congress of the Party since 1926, the year of the military coup that eventually brought Salazar to power. The Extraordinary Congress was attended by 2,000 delegates representing Branches throughout Portugal, and by 5,000 observers invited from the other democratic organisations in Portugal and the ex-colonies. (The first clandestine Congress, held in 1929, was attended by 14 Party members representing a total registered membership of 29!).

The Extraordinary Congress was called to give final approval to changes to the Party's Programme and Statutes, which had been under discussion throughout the Party since the overthrow of Portugal's fascist dictatorship on April 25. Essentially, only that part of the Programme referring to 'immediate measures' was modified, to take into account the changed political situation: these changes took the form of an 'Emergency Platform', to be included in the Party Programme, and which was published immediately following the Congress in the form of a Proclamation, as a statement to the Portuguese people.

At its opening the Extraordinary Congress was addressed by the Secretary-General, Alvaro Cunhal, who also holds the post of Minister without Portfolio in the Provisional Government. In his address—a translation of which is published in the following pages—Comrade Cunhal reviewed the course of political events in Portugal since April 25, and stated the Party's position on the main questions now facing the democratic revolution proceding in that country.

We print below the full text of Comrade Cunhal's Report.

Comrades:

The Central Committee has charged me with the task of reviewing for this Extraordinary Congress the main characteristics of the present political situation and the immediate tasks of the Party.

Greetings

Permit me to begin, however, in the name of the Central Committee, by greeting the Delegates to the Congress and through them all members of our magnificent Party.

There was a time when this hall would have been large enough to hold the whole of our Party many times over. Today, there is no hall or pavilion in Portugal, however large it may be, that could contain all us communists.

Through you, Comrades, we salute all of the members of our Party, not forgetting the young Comrades in their independent youth organisations. We can be confident that in their contribution to the struggle they are worthy of the traditions of the Party, and that they are fully able to shoulder their responsibilities in the construction of the new democratic Portugal.

Permit me also to salute our guests, representatives of the Movement of the Armed Forces and of the Socialist and Popular Democratic Parties, as well as representatives of the Portuguese Democratic Movement and the Left Socialist Movement, the Intersindical, the Young Workers Movement, and the Democratic Movement of Portuguese Women.

The presence of all these groups together at this Congress is a testimony to the links of unity and co-operation existing between those who are struggling to instal in our country a regime of democracy and social progress.

I am sure too that I convey the unanimous sentiments of this Congress in saluting the PAIGC, which today guides the destiny of the Republic of Guiné-Bissau—finally free and sovereign; FRELIMO, today in the Transitional Government of Moçambique, and one year from complete independence; the MPLA, with whose struggle in the complex Angolan situation we are in complete accord; and the forces of liberation in Cabo Verde, S. Tomé, and Principe and Timor, for whose victory we hold out the most sincere hopes.

We do not have the presence at our Congress of delegations from Communist and Workers' Parties of other countries. The only reason for this was the extraordinarily short period of preparation. Nothing has changed in the relations of our Party to brother Parties, nor in our position in relation to the international communist movement. We continue as ever to be guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism, and our policy is one of reinforcement rather than division of the links of friendship and co-operation with brother parties, be they in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, like the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the parties of the socialist countries, acting openly, as in the capitalist West, or forced to endure the hardships of clandestine struggle. To those who are today victims of the repression of fascist and reactionary dictatorships, as was our Party for almost 50 years, we offer the fraternal solidarity of fellow combatants.

Six Months of Freedom

Comrades:

This Congress of ours (the first legal Congress that our Party has held in 48 years) is in itself a demonstration of the radical transformation of political climate that has been witnessed in Portugal since April 25, 1974.

For six months the Portuguese people have enjoyed freedom. The Press publishes without censorship. Parties, trade unions, and democratic bodies organise and act freely. The right of assembly is exercised to the full. The right to strike is recognised.

Meanwhile the colonial wars have been ended, historic steps have been taken towards decolonisation, and diplomatic relations have been opened with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Workers have seen the settlement of many important claims. The establishment of the minimum wage, the conclusion of collective labour agreements, improved conditions for public servants, the winning of new social benefits—all these represent an appreciable improvement in the living standards of the lowest paid groups.

In every sector of our national life, albeit by an irregular and difficult process, the traces of fascism are being removed and our institutions, services, and civil and political procedures are being improved and transformed.

If we consider the relatively short space of time that has passed since April 25, and look at all the changes that have already taken place in political, social, economic and cultural life, we are forced to the conclusion that the revolutionary process is indeed developing rapidly, animated, driven and directed by the alliance of the popular movement and the Movement of the Armed Forces.

The Movement of the Armed Forces (MFA), to which we owe the destruction of the fascist dictatorship and the firm defence of the new democratic situation, which is still playing such a proud role, and on whose shoulders have fallen the crucial decisions in moments of crisis, could not have brought about these transformations by itself. The successes gained could no more have been won by the MFA without the democratic forces and the popular masses than they could have been won by the democratic forces and the popular masses without the MFA.

There are those who refer to what they call "exaggerations" and "excesses" in the popular struggle and in the initiatives taken by the people. If they are talking about some of the provocative acts of pseudo-revolutionary groups then it has to be agreed that these acts actually prejudice the development of the popular movement of the masses rather than helping it. If they serve anyone, they serve reaction.

But without the struggle of the industrial working class, of the mass of workers, of the peasants, young workers and students, the intellectuals, the women and the middle classes—without the driving force of the popular masses in the political struggle—the freedoms so far achieved would be incomparably more restricted; if we had liberties at all, that is. Without the popular struggle the whole process of demoratisation would be incomparably retarded.

The experience of the past six months has shown that the course of events in this revolutionary process is determined by the alliance of the popular movement with the Movement of the Armed Forces.

This correlation of forces gives us confidence that the road is open to the consolidation of liberty, to elections, and to the building of a democratic Portugal.

September 28—Victory of the Alliance between the People and the MFA

The reactionaries have tried to take the offensive several times over these six months, endangering the new democratic situation, and attempting to destroy our freedom and instal a new dictatorship.

With Professor Palma Carlos and his accomplices the plan was for a constitutional coup d'état, by which the Council of State would give full powers to General Spínola through his Prime Minister; to this end an electoral masquerade was planned to elect the General as President of the Republic, evading the mandate of the Movement of the Armed Forces while claiming the mandate of the Nation, and thus, quite constitutionally, installing a new dictatorship.

In the case of the "silent majority" there was not even to be a cover of constitutionality. It was to be the "Nation" who came out on to the streets and, in an atmosphere of armed provocation, demand the intervention of General Spínola, their saviour.

In their general preparation the two plans were similar. In both cases the attempted coup was preceded by social agitation artificially created through "strikes", (lacking cause or justification), and by fascist and leftist demonstrations and noisy provocations, producing a climate of "disorder in the streets" and of "chaos", and thus providing apparent reasons for the conspirators' demands. Was it by chance, for instance, that it was precisely on September 27 that the adventurers at TAP (Portuguese Airlines) published an alarmist communique

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the "lack of safety" on the airline's flights?

The defeat of the Palma Carlos manoeuvre resulted in a significant loss of ground for the reactionaries. With their defeat in September they paid an even heavier price.

This resounding defeat was brought about by two factors.

The Popular Movement

The first was the popular mass movement, in which our Party played a decisive role. As soon as the counter-revolutionary move was launched it was our Party that exposed its aims, that made known its dangers, that discerned that the demonstration of the so-called 'silent majority' was part of a vast conspiracy to reinstate dictatorship, and that took the initiative in organising open resistance, assuming the responsibilities and taking the risks.

So long as the general feeling was still that the demonstration would be allowed to take place, there were those who would not believe that any dangers existed, or who underestimated them, and others who preferred to wait and see.

But helped resolutely from the very beginning by the Movement for a Democratic Portugal, by the Intersindical and the trade unions, by the Young Workers Movement and the Union of Communist Students, the Party mobilised the masses to resist.

The great popular action which spanned the length of the country, often with the help of the Armed Forces, setting up barricades and control systems on the roads and railways, cutting the route of the "march on Lisbon" and disorganising and dislocating the reactionaries' plans, was the most brilliant and decisive popular action since April 25, and a confirmation of the strength of the organisation, the capacity and the importance of the masses in the defence and construction of democracy.

In the victory demonstrations that followed, while thousands of communists, understanding the complexity of the political situation, kept their banners rolled, others were unfurling theirs, claiming honours that did not belong to them. However, these minor misunderstandings are not significant. The essential thing was that reaction was repelled, and that the popular and democratic forces came through strengthened, hardened, and united by the victory.

Movement of the Armed Forces

The second factor in our victory, and the one which in the final stages gave it its depth and significance, was the Movement of the Armed Forces. Intervening decisively at exactly the right moment, seeking out and dismantling the clandestine cells, countermanding the initially successful attempt to silence the television, the radio, and the Press, the Movement of the Armed Forces, siding with the people and defending democracy, completed the resounding defeat of reaction, removed the three reactionary Generals in the Junta of National Salvation, and finally brought about the dismissal of General Spínola.

Objectively, much of the process of democratisation and decolonisation was held back by the activities of General Spínola and those three Generals. Many manoeuvres and reactionary conspiracies revolved around them. The over-confident General Galvao de Melo, gave the game away several times. In each case, when we followed the trail of conspiracy, we were led to Belem (the official Residence of the President of the Republic).

The objective of all the plots of the reactionaries (and specifically the attempted constitutional coup of Palma Carlos and the great counter-revolutionary operation of September 28) was for General Spínola to take full powers, to declare a state of emergency, repress the democratic forces, dissolve the Movement of the Armed Forces, and liquidate all liberties.

Thus General Spínola became a fulcrum of the reactionary and conservative forces. The basic story of the complex political power struggle in the first five months after April 25 was the story of the conflict between , on the one hand, the Movement of the Armed Forces and the democratic movement, and on the other the conservative forces with, as their effective consolidator, General Spínola, then President of the Republic.

It can be said that the most important measures of democratisation and decolonisation were taken in spite of the General. As we have said before, for a certain time he did play a positive role. But eventually he became a brake on democratic policies.

The Dangers have not Passed

September 28 remains a date of over-riding importance in the history of the Portuguese democratic revolution. Political power is now more homogeneous, with a greater capacity for action. The apparatus of the State has been consolidated. The Movement of the Armed Forces and the democratic forces have been strengthened. The alliance between the popular movement and the Movement of the Armed Forces is confirmed in its role as the political axis of the democratic transformations of the country.

It is still too soon to measure the full effect of the defeat of counter-revolution at the end of September.

If the progressive forces can take the proper steps to fully exploit their victory, then it will be possible to say that the process of democratisation in Portugal is irreversible.

It should not be assumed that the dangers have passed, or that the reactionary forces have no chance of recovery and that from here on all will be easy.

This is not so. Reaction continues strong and active. It still holds positions of power in the State.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It holds economic power and uses it against the democratic process and against decolonisation.

But precisely because reaction is partially demoralised, immediate emergency measures must be taken for the defence of liberty, the strengthening of the democratic State, and the solution of economic and financial problems.

An Inevitable Choice

The threat to liberty does not exist only in the counter-revolutionary activities of conspirators. The principal threat to liberty comes from economic power that strangles the development of the country and which is the basis of the political and financial support of counter-revolution.

The monopolists and latifundists refuse to accept the new democratic situation. They refuse to accept a situation in which they must pay better wages to the workers and in which they must give up the opportunity to multiply their capital several times over in only a few years. It is they who form the principal obstacle to independent economic development, to the raising of the standard of living of the labouring classes and of the masses of workers in the countryside, and to the relief of the small industrialists, traders, and farmers.

At the same time that they are conspiring to reimpose a dictatorship for the forcible protection of the unlimited exploitation of the Portuguese people, they are sabotaging the economy, cutting credit, cancelling investments and orders, organising the flight of capital, paralysing or cutting back the work of the factories, leaving fields unploughed and harvests ungathered, sacking workers without just reason, seeking by all of this to create a grave economic situation in which the disorganisation of production and other difficulties arouse discontent, set the people against the Government, and so open up the road to counter-revolution.

Events have shown, and continue to show, that democratisation and decolonisation are opposed by their principal adversaries, the monopolists and latifundists.

We must not allow liberty to be threatened, compromised and strangled by a half dozen families. The selfish interests of such a half dozen families cannot be allowed to impose themselves on a whole people.

The objective development of the economy poses one inescapable alternative: if economic power continues in the same hands as in the past, development will be based on starvation wages of the workers and the ruin of the middle-classes—and that mode of development can be realised only through the imposition of a new terrorist dictatorship.

If a regime of liberty and democracy is to survive and develop, it must limit and finally liquidate the economic power of the monopolists and latifundists, intervene increasingly in the economy (without prejudice to non-monopolistic private enterprise) nationalise key sectors and hand over the big estates to the peasants.

Economic and Political Power

After April 25 economic and political power ceased to be coincident. Political power is now in the hands of the democratic forces, who are following policies designed to defend the interests of the people and the country. But economic power remains in the hands of the monopolists and latifundists. This situation cannot be maintained for very long. Either the monopolists and latifundists will take back political power, installing a new dictatorship, or the popular movement must construct a new democratic Portugal by putting an end to the economic power of the monopolists and latifundists.

We will do everything to ensure that this contradiction is resolved by the second alternative. We are confident that this is in fact how it will be resolved.

Today, possibly, the conditions for radical social reform have not been created. But the actual survival of democracy and of social and economic stability demand adequate anti-monopolistic and anti-latifundist measures.

The Programme of the Movement of the Armed Forces indicates an "anti-monopolistic strategy" as the principal driving force of "a new economic policy at the service of the Portuguese people, in particular the most disfavoured groups." The present situation demands the urgent and practical application of this idea.

In accordance with that principle, considered indispensable to the solution of our most difficult problems, the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP) proposes to the Portuguese people, through this Congress, an Emergency Platform. That Platform is now inscribed in the Programme of the Party, as a definition of the immediate priority tasks.

To secure a democratic course for Portuguese politics, to guide the country towards free elections to the Constituent Assembly, to create the indispensable basis for the installation of a democratic regime, the policy of our country must be guided in three fundamental directions: the defence of freedom and the strengthening of the democratic State; the prosecution of decolonisation; and the defence of economic and financial stability with a view to development.

Defence of Freedom and Strengthening of the Democratic State

The fascist and reactionary conspirators tried to justify their aims in September with a supposed threat to liberty on the part of the communists. General Spínola also used the same pretext when he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demanded full powers and the declaration of a state of emergency—in effect the liquidation of freedoms, the suspension of constitutional guarantees, and the installation of a new dictatorship.

How they contradict themselves, these people who invoke a non-existent threat to liberty as a pretext for their own destruction of liberty!

Yesterday, today, and always, no-one more than the communists has, does and will struggle for the liberty of our people. The PCP struggles so that today and tomorrow there shall be freedom of speech, of organisation, of protest—all that our people require to live in freedom, to respect it and to defend it. In September the communists and others accused of endangering freedom were precisely those who saved that freedom.

It is reaction that will not desist from attacking freedom. And it is to safeguard freedom that we must impose a clear and firm policy, and execute a range of emergency measures in the shortest possible time.

In the first place the rights and freedoms of citizens that now exist after September 28 must be guaranteed, and a number of the diplomas (acts of Parliament, government decisions etc. *Translator's note*) under discussion and in the course of promulgation must be examined in a new light.

In the second place, the democratic State must be strengthened by the purging of reactionary elements, by the reorganisation of the militarised and police forces, turning them into real forces for the defence of the democratic order, by placing people in key posts who have the full confidence of the democratic forces, and by the formation of a civil service dedicated to the new political situation.

Finally, to guarantee respect of the democratic order, fascist and reactionary organisations, activities and propaganda must be prohibited, and conspiracy and economic sabotage severely punished.

Only the enemies of democracy can criticise democracy for defending itself.

If the fascists and reactionaries had succeeded on September 28 (or if they succeed in the future) they will not take power with carnations in their rifles but, as they made clear on the eve of their last attempt, will destroy freedom in a sea of blood.

On the Road to Decolonisation

The Portuguese people struggled for almost half a century to free themselves from tyranny. Today they must take every step necessary to ensure that tyranny does not return. Not to do so would be unthinkable.

We will defend the fullest freedom. And we will defend it with a firm hand (as firm as is necessary) against its enemies.

The historic steps taken along the road to decolonisation constitute further evidence of the new Portuguese political situation.

When we remember that throughout the years our Party, other democratic forces, and the youth of Portugal, have put the end of the colonial war and the recognition of the right to complete and immediate independence of the peoples subjected to Portuguese colonialism at the centre of our struggle, it becomes easier to understand what the steps taken in this direction mean to us.

The end of the colonial war, the recognition of the Republic of Guiné-Bissau and the establishment of State to State relations, the formation of the Transitional Government of Moçambique by FRELIMO and the moves begun to establish total independence within the space of one year, constitute historic victories for the peoples of Guiné-Bissau and of Moçambique and also for the Portuguese people who, finally free of the fascist dictatorship, made a valuable contribution to accelerate the process and now co-operate as brothers.

The great steps taken must not, however, lead us to close our eyes to the complex problems and the great difficulties that remain.

Situations could arise that could hold back the process in some territories, with grave consequences for the internal situation in Portugal.

In our view the policy to be followed, while taking account of the specific characteristics of each case, must continue along the same line of real and effective recognition of the right of each people to self-determination and independence.

This is true for Cabo Verde, for Angola, for S. Tomé and Príncipe, for Timor, and for Macau.

There could be no solution to the problem of Cabo Verde if this principle were not observed, if the right of the PAIGC to develop its activities freely was not recognised, if the defenders of independence were repressed and the creation of puppet-parties at the service of neo-colonialism was encouraged.

Equally slight would be the chance of a solution in Angola if any attempt was made to push the MPLA outside of the general process and out of the negotiations, or if any other move was directed against the party that led the liberation movement. Immediate measures must be taken to guarantee freedom of development for the MPLA in Angola.

In the complex colonial problem it is essential to ensure that the war will not begin again. It is necessary as soon as circumstances allow to recall the soldiers and sailors and reduce the period of compulsory military service. At more than 25 million contos annually, (about £400 million) military expenditure constitues a major obstacle to the development of the national economy and to the improvement of the standard of living of the Portuguese people. It is essential drastically to reduce this expenditure as soon as possible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Regarding the new States that have won independence, everything must be done to ensure that fraternal relations develop on a basis of equality, of respect for sovereignty, respect for mutual interests, and non-interference in internal matters.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that Portugal's resources are low and that therefore financial help to the new States will have to be limited.

If this was not taken into account it would be easy to make promises or create illusions which would afterwards be broken, or to follow a policy of financial help that could not be maintained, creating sudden and grave problems for the peoples to whom aid had been given, and aggravating the economic and financial problems confronting Portugal.

Urgent Economic Measures

Portugal finds herself in a grave economic and financial situation, which for the most part is a result of the inheritance left us by fascism: the inheritance of an economy in deficit whose precarious balance rested on external resources.

The economic and financial situation cannot help but suffer the effects of the massive diminution of emigrant remissions and receipts from tourism, of the effects of the world economic climate, and of sabotage by the large Portuguese economic groups and by a number of foreign groups. Some sectional crises (such as in the construction industry), difficulties for small and middle size firms, the freezing of investments, constitute some of the more serious aspects of the situation. The most serious immediate problems are, however, the massive budget deficit, and the adverse trade and payments balances.

If these deficits are not quickly reduced they will endanger the whole economic stability of Portugal.

There are those who try to reassure themselves with the size of the existing reserves. The truth is however that without energetic intervention by the State the reserves that Portugal still has will be rapidly used up.

If we do not know how to deal with the real national economic problems, it is not only the economy that will move directly into a profound crisis. It is Portuguese democracy that will run the risk of expiring.

No Time must be Lost

However, we are not yet there. It is possible to take suitable measures. The essential thing is not to lose time.

If an individual has insufficient income he can do one of two things: either he can arrange to get more or he can remedy the situation by spending less. The same applies to public finance.

On the one hand a policy of real austerity must be applied, cutting immediately non-essential State expenditure, and specifically, now that the war is finished, as much military expenditure as possible. On the other hand receipts from taxes must be increased, not from the workers or the small industrialists, traders, and farmers, but from the big holders of wealth.

Improvement of the management of public companies is also a matter of the utmost urgency, doing away with the scandalous precept that public companies should make a loss when before, as private companies, they made vast profits.

If there is a big deficit in the trade balance and in the balance of payments the essential remedy is to export more and, in addition, to make a decided effort to import less, with massive reductions in non-essential imports.

To this end effective negotiations must be pushed ahead with the socialist countries and with the Common Market, taking into account the different levels of development.

Government Control and Planning

But this alone is not enough. Given the disorder in the efforts of private companies in the race for new markets, it is essential that the Government ensures their direction, 'control' and planning.

The nationalisation of some of the banks offers new possibilities for State intervention in the economy, whether by a directing and corrective role through the Bank of Portugal, by attracting deposits through the commercial section of the National Overseas Bank, by obliging the insurance companies to make their deposits with the CGDCP (the Government Savings and Deposit Bank), or by the use of other methods of State intervention that force the private money market to revitalise its activities. The big capitalists say that they have no money, yet at the same time they are transferring funds abroad, utilising all available methods, from friends prepared to take the risks of running contraband, to the illegal use of diplomatic bags. Control of the flight of capital must be drastically improved, and the authors and accomplices of this flight must be severely punished.

If the flight of capital shows that disposable capital exists, there is no justification in the affirmation that there is no money for investment. It has to be said to these gentlemen that if we accept the mobilisation of the workers, we must also expect the mobilisation of capital.

With respect to industry, there too the lines of action open to the State are varied.

In the first place support must be given to those companies, large or small, that invest capital and contribute positively to the development and expansion of production.

In the second place severe measures must be taken against economic sabotage, against closures, short-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time working and unjustified dismissals, bringing companies involved in irregularities, speculation, and frauds under strict control.

In the third place the industrial sector of the State must be decidedly strengthened, with improvement of the management and efficiency of public companies and the establishment of new State or mixed enterprises.

In fourth place there must be support for small and medium-sized firms.

There is much discussion on whether in the present situation foreign investment should be encouraged or made more difficult. We think that it should be facilitated, but only if there is sufficient State control.

Problems of State Intervention

Increased State intervention places before us complex administrative problems. Even during the time of the dictatorship, with the progress of State monopoly capitalism, there was some administration on behalf of the State and by Government appointees. The function of these administrators was, however, through their positions in the managment bodies of the corporations to put the services of the State at the service of those corporations. In reality they should be doing the opposite: that is, defending the interests of the State, even to the detriment of private interests, when there are contradictions between the two. This demands capable staff, conscientious, even though they may have a minimum of experience, and dedicated to the present political situation. Our problems will not be solved with the aid of disaffected elements, or reinstated throwouts of fascism.

The situation demands the continued vigilance of workers over the administration of State firms, and the proposal to the Government of serious people able to hold management positions.

There are those who do not like what they call injections of personnel into companies.

But these injections are necessary, even though here and there mistakes might be made. For we are in an unusual situation, in which we must defend the interests of the community in circumstances in which it would be impossible to secure that defence without the participation of the workers.

Questions of the Countryside

No less grave than the problems confronting public finance and industry are the problems that face Portuguese agriculture.

The labouring population of our countryside is experiencing serious difficulties that must be faced head-on and with some urgency. Firstly because the problems are real and because they affect the lives of millions of Portuguese and the general condition of the country. And secondly because the democratic revolution won in the cities must not be lost in the countryside.

Democracy has a solid base of support in the South, among the proletariat of Ribatejo and Alentejo, and can count on the support of the peasants of some other regions, whose struggle through their Leagues and Associations we must strengthen and develop.

But it would be an illusion to think that democracy has the same support in the country districts of the centre, the interior, and the North. In those regions rich reactionary landowner-bosses hold the people in the utmost obscurantism, dominating and terrorising their consciences through the power to cut off the work and the bread of the population.

These reactionaries declare that if the communists come (they call "communist" anyone who struggles for a democratic Portugal) they will take the land and the homes of the peasants, kill the old and infirm, steal the wives from their husbands and the sons from their mothers; unfortunately many of these communities are so isolated that there are many who believe these cock-and-bull stories.

We must not become pessimists when faced with these realities. We have to work to change them. And if we know how to work, they will be changed.

The situation demands a massive campaign of clarification. We have to send courageous and sensitive propagandists to these regions, able to defeat political ignorance and anti-communist and anti-democratic ideas, and to breach the walls of political isolation raised by reaction through vast areas of our countryside.

Win the Peasants for the Democratic Revolution

But propaganda and clarification will not be enough to eliminate deep-rooted prejudices, to recover certain classes from the domination of local tyrannies, to attract the peasantry to the democratic revolution, and to turn the small landowner, the small tenant-farmer, into firm and confident defenders of the present political line. Only concrete measures that relate to, and solve, his most pressing problems will really link the peasant to the aims of democracy.

Propaganda is very necessary. But in the end it is not words but acts that will draw the peasantry into the revolution.

If the new political situation ensures that they can sell, and sell at realistic prices, those products, such as wine and almonds, which at the moment they must struggle to sell; if the same applies to milk and other products; if taxes and levies are reduced; if the common lands are restored to the population; if the system of rentals and partnerships is revised, with the lengthening of leasing periods, the reduction of rents, and the payment of rents in money if the tenant so wishes; if good terms are given for credit—if the new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political situation resolves these and other problems, then yes, the peasantry will become firm supporters of the revolution.

The situation in the countryside demands these measures and others of greater scope.

It is essential to consider State requisition of uncultivated lands and their handing over to co-operatives, to family farms, or to forms of public management. The commercial circuits must be restructured and simplified. The tax load on small peasants must be reduced at the same time as that on the big landowners and absentee landlords is increased. Help must be given in the form of credits, machines, technical support, and the formation and reorganisation of co-operatives—not those false co-operatives that were instruments of the exploitation of millions of peasants by a few big farmers and capitalists, but true co-operatives constituted and freely managed by small and medium-size farmers.

It is a whole new agrarian policy that is required, with emergency measures to resolve the most pressing problems of the working population in the countryside, and thus draw the peasantry inescapably into the revolutionary current that is building a prosperous and free Portugal.

The Workers' Demands and the Price of Freedom

It is the Portuguese workers who pay most dearly for the difficulties that exist in our national economy.

Certainly, since April 25 the workers have gained more in the satisfaction of their demands than they gained in many years of fascist dictatorship. The national minimum wage, though modest, improved the standard of living of many hundreds of thousands of Portuguese. New social benefits have been won.

But the aggravation of the general economic situation, inflation, and the crises in some sectors of industry and agriculture are rapidly annulling the gains and improvements made and throwing thousands out of work, as is the case in the construction industry, electronics, and in the Alentejo.

The workers, though avoiding entanglement in actions for unrealistic demands, must not moderate the struggle for the improvement of their living standards. They must demand the observation of collective labour contracts, which a part of management still refuses to recognise. They must insist on the periodic readjustment of wages in line with the increase of prices. They must demand improved social benefits. They must keep up the struggle to prohibit unjustified dismissals. They must insist on the opening of public works and the allocation of subsidies. They must insist on the holding of prices of essential goods and house rents.

On the struggle with the owners and through the trade unions, two observations must be made.

The first is that workers must decide democratically on the demands to be presented and take care not to present demands demagogically inflated by reactionaries or pseudo-revolutionaries interested in creating difficulties and in provoking collisions and ruptures between the workers and the Provisional Government.

The second is that the workers must select the most appropriate forms of struggle, bearing in mind all of the social and political consequences of their activities.

It has to be recognised that in the present Portuguese political situation quiet and organised pressure is the most effective way of achieving democratic changes. Disruptions of production and of transport —anything that aggravates the economic situation— benefits reaction and not the workers. Because of this we have insisted many times that in the present situation the strike, though it remains an indispensable weapon of the workers through which numerous victories have been won since April 25, must be used only after it has been seen that no other form of struggle would be adequate, and after considering whether the particular strike is likely to cause serious economic and social disruption, which can only benefit reaction.

There are those who believe that the current state of the national economy demands that the workers temporarily hold back from improving their standard of living, or even accept worse conditions if these be necessary.

Certainly the Portuguese workers are prepared to pay the price of liberty with their sweat and their blood. But those who enrich themselves on the sweat of the working people and who have the wealth of the country in their hands must pay too.

The workers are the first to understand that to construct a new and democratic Portugal it will be necessary to work long and hard. The economy is running at a loss. Even if all bourgeois profits were eliminated and wealth distributed more fairly, our national production would not, at its present level, secure the accumulation necessary to produce rapid economic development and a plentiful life for all Portuguese. To improve the general living standards it will be necessary to increase production at an accelerated rate. And this demands not only investment but more and better work.

The Portuguese workers are ready to work harder when it is for themselves, for the national community, and for the country; but not when it is for a parasitic bourgeoisie whose ostentation is an insult to the hard and often miserable lives of the great mass of working people.

Work harder for the country, yes. Work harder for the exploiters, no.

The response to the appeal of the Prime Minister Brigadier Vasco Goncalves for a Sunday of voluntary work on October 6 showed that the Portuguese

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers, when the order of the day is the construction of a Portugal for the Portuguese and not for the exploiting classes, will be capable of working more hours per week, with more intensity and more accuracy, and that they will see in work not the obligatory fatigue of earning the daily bread, but a reason for honour, for pride, and even for heroism.

We are certain—absolutely certain—that that day will come.

The Elections to the Constituent Assembly

It will fall to the Constituent Assembly elected next Spring to develop the constitution of the future Portuguese Republic. The Republic will be that which the deputies approve, and the deputies will be those that the electorate chooses.

In this lies the extraordinary importance of the next elections and the necessity that they be truly free, with an electorate unfettered by any physical, material or psychological coercion. The counting of the votes must be strictly controlled by the people, to ensure that they are a true expression of the popular will.

If the electoral law establishes principles and norms that could lead, by one way or another, to falsification of the will of the people, the result will not be the indisputable representation of the people that all feel obliged to respect. If, for example, organisations like the Portuguese Democratic Movement are not permitted to put up candidates; if no means is established allowing the Movement of the Armed Forces to put up their own candidates if they wish; if the vote of the emigrants is organised so that they have to vote in the sort of consulates we still find in countries with reactionary dictatorships—anything that will prejudice the authenticity of the elections as the free and democratic elections for which the Portuguese people have struggled over so many years.

The PCP will continue its struggle to ensure that the elections are truly free and, if they are, will respect the will of the people, demanding that all others do the same.

It is often asked what is the Party's plan of action for the elections. Will we contest them? Will we make common lists? Will we establish fronts with other parties? It seems, comrades, still too early to answer such questions. Everything depends upon the situation then existing, and at this time it is difficult to predict what that situation will be.

However one general principle is to be borne in mind: that the elections must not constitute a motive for divisions and ruptures between the democratic forces, but must help to reinforce unity and alliances, bearing in mind the tasks of building a democratic Portugal.

The prime objective of this phase of the struggle is the establishment of a democratic regime chosen by the people. We are struggling for the installation of a regime in which full democratic liberties will be recognised: of the press, of association, the formation of parties, of assembly and of trade unions, as well as the right to strike.

These are our objectives, and in no way can they give rise to disquiet among friends or enemies.

At the same time we are struggling for a regime in which profound social reforms will have a place; in which full realisation will be given to the eight points that our Party considers necessary to the present stage of the national and democratic revolution:

—the creation of a democratic State organisation;
—destruction of the power of the monopolies and the pursuit of rapid economic development;
—agrarian reform;
—substantial improvements in the standard of living of the working classes and of the people in general;
—democratisation of education and of cultural activities;
—liberation of Portugal from imperialism;
—immediate recognition of the right to independence of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies, should any still exist at the time of the installation of the new regime;
—pursuit of a policy of peace and friendship with all peoples;

With the installation of a democratic regime there will exist full possibilities for the peaceful development of the revolutionary process, realising far-reaching social reforms within the framework of democratic legality.

Some of the specific characteristics of the Portuguses democratic revolution, among them the alliance People-Movement of the Armed Forces, create favourable conditions for a peaceful road to the democratic transformation of Portuguese society.

We are committed to such a road, and will do everything to ensure that it becomes a reality.

For Popular Unity—For Alliance of the People with the MFA

In today's struggle to defend and consolidate freedom, and in tomorrow's struggle to instal a regime chosen by the people and to construct a democratic Portugal, the pursuit of a policy of unity and alliances is indispensable.

Failure of the existing unity and alliances would rapidly lead to the defeat of democracy. Strengthening of unity and alliance will secure the road to victory.

It is our job to strengthen the unity of the working class in the factories and in every place of work, in the daily struggles as well as in great political actions.

It is our job to strengthen the unity of the peasants, struggling for a fully democratic life, without

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

external interference in trade union activity, and for a single, central trade union organisation.

It is our job to strengthen the unity of the peasants, developing their Leagues and Associations.

It is our job to strengthen the unity of the young workers in action and in organisation, and to strengthen the student youth in their associations and their initiatives.

It is our job to strengthen the unity of action of all popular classes and groups, of the proletariat, of the peasantry, intellectuals, the small urban bourgeoisie —even sections of the medium bourgeoisie—in the struggle for a democratic Portugal.

It is our job to reinforce the unity between the PCP and the Portuguese Democratic Movement, and between the PCP, the Socialist Party, and other democratic parties.

Finally, it is our job to strengthen the alliance between the popular movement and the Movement of the Armed Forces, indispensable condition for the success of the revolutionary process.

A Policy of Unity

Struggling for unity, it is necessary to combat firmly the fabricators and abettors of division.

We seek to clarify this position to the workers and to the masses, and not to leave them impeded by divisive political positions. We are maintaining implacably our co-operation with the Portuguese Democratic Movement (MPD), which others would like to see pushed aside and dissolved.

We are combating trade union divisionism, even when it is presented as defence of liberty. To struggle for unity is, necessarily, to struggle against divisionism.

It is also necessary to unmask and isolate the small pseudo-revolutionary groups, groups outside of the working class and democratic movement, whose preferred targets are the PCP, the Provisional Government, the MFA, and other democratic organisations, and who in industry, in schools, and wherever they appear, conduct campaigns of division, intrigue and of provocation, at times using the violent and intolerant methods of fascists. It has to be underlined that the greatest propagandists and defenders of the right of activity of these groups are found on the reactionary right, which, objectively, they serve with their irresponsible activity.

The policy of unity has always been a part of the activity of the PCP. Unity is for today and for tomorrow. We are ready to travel together and in unity with all those who wish to unite in the struggle for the same objectives.

We do not understand unity as mere declarations of good will and good intentions. For the Party, unity is expressed, manifested, consolidated, and developed in common activity and struggle.

It is from beginning to end the popular struggle that determines the course of events. A proper solution to the great national problems is impossible without the struggle of the popular masses. In the present political situation, strict co-operation between the Provisional Government, the MFA, state entities, local authorities, political parties, trade unions, peasant leagues, co-operatives, youth organisations, women's and other organisations, will make the forces of democracy invincible, and make the revolutionary process irreversible.

The alliance between the People and the Movement of the Armed Forces is not a transitory alliance. It decides the present and will decide the future. Its consolidation is indispensable in the period leading up to the elections, and after the elections in the peaceful construcion of a new society.

Portuguese Communist Party, Revolutionary Vanguard of the Working Class and the Popular Masses

Comrades:

This Extraordinary Congress is a testimony to the role of the Party in the present political situation.

It is, in fact, an extraordinary Extraordinary Congress in every way: in its aim, in its form and the speed with which it was convened, in its hurried preparation, and certainly in the work that will result from it.

But the situation in which we live is also extraordinary. Political reality is bringing our plans into focus, and the life of the Party, responding to the demands of the situation, is taking on new and original aspects.

The single aim of the work of the Congress is the modification of the Programme and Statutes of the Party, taking account of the fact that we are no longer fighting against a fascist dictatorship and are struggling in a situation of freedom; that we have stopped being a clandestine party and have become a legal party and a part of the Government.

Changes to the Programme and Rules have become essential.

In my contribution here, made in the name of the Central Committee, the main lines of the Party's new orientation were presented.

The ideas expressed suggest the complete replacement of Chapter II of the Programme. As you know this is a chapter covering the immediate tasks. Obviously the immediate tasks in the time of the dictatorship were completely different from those that face us today.

Our Programme and Rules

We have put into the Programme an Emergency Platform, discussed in the Party before the Congress. If it is approved it will be presented for the approval of the people and of the democratic forces.

In the alterations to the Programme certain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressions currently used in Marxist terminology are removed or modified. No ideological significance should be attributed to this.

The main reason is that some expressions are not generally understood in the sense that we give to them. In current usage they have meanings completely contrary. Their use in the present conditions would give rise to harmful misunderstandings about our policy, and to the consideration that it would have a negative effect on the efforts of the democratic forces and the masses.

This is the case, for example, with the term 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. In marxist terminology dictatorship is a form of domination of one class or classes over another class or classes. The most liberal of bourgeois democracies is a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The dictatorship of the proletariat, in which the proletariat and their allies hold power, can have many forms. It can be multiparty. It can embrace numerous forms of State organisation. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a more democratic regime than the most democratic of bourgeois democracies. Nevertheless, the expression 'dictatorship' used now in Portugal after 50 years of fascist dictatorship is used in a very particular situation, and its use would make understanding of the Party's policies and tasks that much more difficult.

Nothing has changed in our concepts and in our doctrines. This must be made clear.

No answers will be given by this Congress to many of the varied new problems faced by the Party. That will be the task of the next ordinary Congress, which will be held as soon as possible.

Growth of the Party

Since April 25 the Party has been considerably strengthened. Its organisation has been built on a national scale, numerous Work Centres having been opened already. In spite of feelings of insecurity that have sometimes resulted from the political situation, and in spite of the difficulties resulting from the need to adapt to a system of registration of members, the number of Party members has grown steadily. Partial data indicates that from June to September effective membership doubled, 60 per cent now being workers, and 18 per cent unemployed.

Avante has a wide circulation, and the same can be said of other Party publications.

Without doubt we have moved forward. Nevertheless, the pace of success must not make us lose our heads. We have weaknesses in our organisation, propaganda, and training. We must correct and improve them.

The Party has always followed the policy of calm and objective assessment of its activities, study of its successes and experiences, the correction of weaknesses, faults and errors. This technique should not change simply because the Party is stronger.

The Portuguese Communist Party is the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and the popular masses. Its role in the present course of Portuguese democracy is irreplaceable. From its nature and from its role come its heavy responsibility before the other democratic forces, before the people and the Country.

We are sure, comrades, that all members of the Party will work to ensure that the Party meets its responsibilities.

Long live the unity of the working class!

Long live the unity of the democratic forces!

Long live the alliance of the popular movement with the Movement of the Armed Forces!

Long live the Portuguese Communist Party!

(*Translated by Ted Slade*)

Discussion Contribution on:

Trends in Youth Culture

Tom Bell

I welcome Martin Jacques' article on Youth Culture which was free of dogma and well-worn, ready-made answers to the important questions raised by the youth phenomenon.

Discussion on this subject has been all too limited in the Communist Party and YCL and perhaps the rather slow response to this discussion is a reflection of this. However, it has been my fortune to have been involved in a number of discussions which sprang from the original Cultural Committee meeting and therefore to know some points of controversy that arise when examining the various developments we call "Youth Culture".

Youth Culture

It is unfortunate that some Communists should hold up their hands in horror (as did John Boyd, *Marxism Today*, December 1973) at the mere use of the term "youth culture", as not fitting into Lenin's approach.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Boyd embarked on a battle of Lenin quotes —but it can easily be demonstrated that Lenin was not attempting to impose a crude straight-jacket on our concept of culture, purging the impurities of the past and from thence on sticking to the straight and narrow of socialist realism. Nick Kettle (*Marxism Today*, July 1974) very ably presented a more balanced presentation of Lenin. Furthermore, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", which John Boyd quotes, was delivered to the 3rd Komsomol Congress in 1920, when the situation existing among West European youth in the 60's could hardly have been imagined.

Denver Walker (*Marxism Today*, July 1974) refuses to use the term "youth culture" replacing it with the inadequate "pop" culture because "a culture is something built up by a people or a class of a particular country or area over centuries, or, at least, decades as a continuous process which does not cease—either for individuals or the class—at the age of 25 or 30."

There are no laws defining how long a culture takes to form—one important point in Martin's article was that the youth culture of the 60's was a very rapid development, this being one of the features that characterised it.

From the mid 1950's through to today there have been manifestations of rebellion by young people on a mass scale. Very often they take a negative form, mainly violence. This happened with the Teddy Boys, the Mods and Rockers, the Skinheads, football violence and so on. But it was not *only* violent and negative. Many features, some contradictory, characterised it. It is this sum total of youth activity that we should be concerned with. There were a diverse number of ways in which young people sought a common identity as *young people*, the process reaching its most advanced stage in 1967-68.

Its central point was, of course, the music boom, but it also encompassed clothes, language (slang), film, dancing, art, poetry, media, ideology and other aspects of young people's lives (although different degrees and forms of it could be found), which, taken as a whole, represent the formation of a new cultural set-up among the young generation. The use of various drugs by some sections was also part of this. Of course there were different levels of consciousness of the rebellion among the youth, from the *lumpen* violence through the idealist and anarchist trends to the passionate anti-imperialist demonstrations. But there were certain common features, again mainly in musical taste, but also in dress style and various other points.

It is the wholesale writing off of all this as some kind of bourgeois plot, or at best "handed down" (Denver Walker, *ibid*) that we must avoid. Of course there were negative, even reactionary trends; of course the capitalists jumped on (but did not *create*) the bandwagon. But the phenomenon in general was the result of the youth *themselves* searching for autonomy and thus arriving at a rejection of many of the *effects* of capitalism, without yet understanding the system itself and what it should be replaced with.

A Point of Departure

It has been said that, although the youth upsurge was critical of capitalism, it also rejected Marxism. This reminds me of the slogan "If they are not with us, they are against us". This was reversed by Janos Kadar to "If they are not against us they are with us". Do we seriously mean to shun any trend that criticises capitalism because it also rejects marxism? Or do we work with it and seek to win it to our position.

Whatever the motives of the capitalists who make profits from the boom, the point is that for masses of young people the upsurge was in fact *a point of departure from the status quo and therefore from capitalism.*

Communists correctly recognise that historically the point of departure from capitalism for the working class occurs mainly in the economic field when they come into conflict with the employers and, nowadays, the State. But there can be other points which from time to time may take on big proportions.

As communists we work in a principled way in the Trade Unions and Labour movement. We recognise the wide spectrum of political trends within the movement and seek unity on specific issues with as many other Labour movement people as possible, even if on other issues we strongly disagree.

We participate in the many economic struggles, understanding that important political lessons can be drawn from the everyday struggle and not falling into the ultra-left trap of dismissing such struggle as "reformist". Why then should we not apply the same dialectics to the development of youth culture in the 60's and try to perceive its positive, rebellious content, encouraging it and integrating some of its features into our own style of work?

The capitalists may encourage aspects of the culture for their own purposes. They encourage the right-wing in the Labour movement for their own purposes too, but we still argue for the need to work in the movement, combatting the right and dismissing the ultra-left attempts to form "rank-and-file" counter-organisations as a substitute for the official movement.

In the same way we should not alienate ourselves from the youth phenomenon ,but identify with it and counteract its negative tendencies, such as the drug culture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A further criticism of youth culture in the 60's is that, as the dominant culture in society is the ruling class culture, youth culture was essentially bourgeois culture or an expression of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois search for individualism.

This very crude approach to culture, by dismissing the desire of people for their own individual fulfillment plays right into the hands of the ruling class who use it against marxism. It is also in essence defeatist as it implies that the working class are not capable of seizing their areas of confrontation (which they are) with capitalism, taking the initiative *in all spheres* of struggle and giving leadership *in every aspect* of the life of our people, including youth's search through youth culture for its independence.

Thus the YCL sought in the 60's to come to terms with the complex developments taking place among young people. For this reason much criticism of the League's work in this period (in particular of the 1967 "*The Trend-Communism*" campaign, not incidently simply "*The Trend*" as is often said) is made without any consideration of the real situation among young people at the time, and should be refuted.

Is Youth Culture now Dead?

As Martin Jacques pointed out, youth culture reached a stage in 1968 in which there was a considerable overlap in cultural styles between the different strata of young people. After that, from 1969 on, many of the illusions built up in young minds began to crumble. The cultural movement was increasingly bound up with big business, contradicting its own ideals. The ideology of the more politically conscious sections of the movement lost credibility as it could not fundamentally challenge capitalism. Other aspects of the culture either died or were absorbed by big business. Some, however, remained. The big groups illustrate this process. They either split or with the fading away of their popular base in mass audiences went into producing LPs.

Is youth culture now dead? Certainly the phenomenon of the 60's has largely disintegrated, but it has made a permanent impact on society in a number of ways. It is as yet difficult to predict how it will affect the behaviour and attitudes of people in the future, as the young generation of the 60's get older, but a number of aspects of these developments will certainly continue.

The 1970's have not seen a creative ongoing development on a mass scale of the '60's phenomenon. The decline from '68 of pop music into its different strands has led to the "quality" groups (if not splitting, as stated above) becoming esoteric while the new mass appeal groups and singers, like the Osmonds, Gary Glitter, David Cassidy and to a lesser extent Slade (who I feel do retain some of the rapport with their followers), drum out infantile material aimed at an infantile audience. Motown and Reggae live on with a variety of other mundane material in the charts, with some honourable exceptions.

Youth and the Labour Movement

But the comprehensive youth revolt into culture could well spring up again in very new and unpredictable forms. Whatever happens, the Labour movement must seek to draw the youth to it in forms best suited to specific characteristics of the young.

What is most indelible from the 1960's is that, more than in any previous epoch, the young generation are now seen as a specific section of society who *in their own way* must come to terms with its problems and make their contribution to changing it. Why is it important to recognise this? Because:

> "the middle aged and the aged often *do not know how* to approach the youth, for the youth must of necessity advance to socialism *in a different way, along other paths, in other forms, in other circumstances* than their fathers. . . . That is why we must decidedly favour *the organisational independence* of the Youth League not only because the opportunists fear this independence, but because of the very nature of the case. For unless they have complete independence the youth *will be unable* either to train good socialists from their midst or prepare themselves to lead socialism *forward*". (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23—Lenin's emphasis).

Much has changed since the 60's. We have had the experience of the Tory government and the left advance in the movement. There have been the mass industrial activities of the miners and the Pentonville 5 struggle. The Labour movement, particularly the Left, must become a pole of attraction to young people in whose eyes it should become a dynamic force, capable of articulating their aspirations and benefiting from their involvement.

This requires far more attention to youth recruitment and provision by the Labour movement. This would in no way contradict the development of the *positive* aspects of the youth phenomenon—the critical questioning, the search for a youth identity through flamboyant styles, musical media, various publications etc. Rather it can give a basic scientific content to it.

The YCL will continue to work on this level, but also projecting our own campaigns and all round activities in a way that aims at the youth as they *are*, not as we would perhaps like them to be. This must entail rejecting the holier-than-thou approach to the life style and culture of young people, avoiding sectarianism and lifting the ideological fight to win young people to socialism and communism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Theory and Practice in Marxist Philosophy

Richard Gunn

(AUTHOR'S NOTE: An earlier version of this paper was given in the philosophy specialist course of the 6th Communist University (July 1974). I am grateful to comrades who took part in discussion for the points they raised, and have tried to incorporate some of these in the paper as it appears below.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The author is a postgraduate student at Edinburgh University and is preparing a thesis on Marxist materialism and dialectics.)

It is no accident that the categories of 'theory' and 'practice', and the question of the relation between them, occupy a central place in Marxist philosophy. Marxism differs from much bourgeois philosophy precisely in that it *poses* this question—a question which, though a traditional one in philosophy from Aristotle onwards[1], is systematically 'defined out' in much current non-Marxist philosophical debate. Marxism appears here (as so often) as heir to a valuable earlier tradition which is threatened by the narrowing and reifying tendencies in bourgeois thought.

The present paper attempts to clarify the relation between the categories of theory and practice in Marxism; to draw some conclusions about distortions of Marxism in 'mechanistic materialist' and 'historicist' directions; and to shed light on some more general topics such as the meanings of the terms 'science' and 'ideology' and the sense in which Marxism can be called a humanism. These questions are approached *via* an account of how Marx developed his views on theory and practice in the process of criticising his immediate philosophical predecessors, Hegel and the Young Hegelians.

HEGEL'S VIEW

Our account can conveniently begin with Hegel who, in an often-quoted passage, expresses the view that philosophy "appears on the scene only when actuality is already there cut and dried after its process of formation." By philosophy, or theory, the world "cannot be rejuvenated but only understood. The Owl of Minerva spreads its wings only with the falling of dusk"[2]. In this passage Hegel seems to propose a total separation between theory and practice. He is specifically excluding the conception of theory as, in Engels' and Lenin's phrase, a "guide to action"[3]. Theory can only comprehend a practice which has already been carried out independently of it.

In Hegel's view, the locomotives of history are not —as in Marx—class struggles, but the activities of heroes or great men whose subjective desires and ambitions merely happen to co-incide with the historical needs of the period in which they live. We might say that, in Hegel, history is made by men who do not understand it (heroes) and understood by men who do not make it (philosophers)[4]. There is theory, and there is practice—but never the twain shall meet.

However, Hegel's full position is less simple than this. In the passage already quoted he is actually arguing *against* what he takes to be a species of separation between theory and practice. For he is opposing the view that philosophy is an affair of "giving instruction as to what the world ought to be" or, as he puts it elsewhere, mere edification[5]. He is against any abstract, moralistic 'ought' (*Sollen*), and here he is on the same ground as Marx and Engels in their later critique of Utopian Socialism[6]. Hegel in fact falls into *one* sort of separation of theory and practice (i.e. the view that theory can

[1] For an account of theory and practice in the history of philosophy, see N. Lobkowicz, *Theory and Practice*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

[2] Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, trans. by T. M. Knox, Oxford, 1967, pp. 12-13.

[3] Engels, letter to F. A. Sorge, 29th November 1886; Lenin, "*Left Wing*" *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Moscow, 1970, p. 54.

[4] Cf. Avineri, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*, Cambridge University Press, 1972, p. 234.

[5] Hegel, *Phenomenology of Mind*, trans. by J. B. Baillie, p. 74: "But philosophy must beware of wishing to be edifying."

[6] Engels' critique of Utopian Socialism is well known; but see also Marx, "Correspondence of 1843", in Karl Marx, *Early Texts*, trans. and ed. by David McLellan, Blackwell, 1971, pp. 80-82.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never guide practice) through his concern to avoid *another* sort (i.e. moralism or utopianism). He poses the problem of the unity of theory and practice but fails to resolve it.

Hegel's ambivalence on this question is particularly evident in his political writings where, in one and the same essay, he says that "The thoughts contained in this essay can have no other aim or effect . . . save that of promoting the understanding of what is", and that "When life is on the brink of decay it can be reorganised only by a procedure involving the maximum of force"[7]. Quietism of activism? Apologetics or revolution? Theory or practice? It can be seen why both conservatives and radicals have been able to find inspiration in Hegel's philosophy.

Marx and The Young Hegelians

It is with the radicals among his followers, the 'Young Hegelians', that we are concerned. We have seen how, for Hegel, theory can merely comprehend —perceive the rationality in—what has already happened, and cannot guide action yet to be undertaken, action in the future. Concerned to overcome the apologetic and conservative implications of this view, the Young Hegelians sought to develop a conception of theory-informed practice, or: *praxis*[8]. To the Young Hegelians, however, 'praxis' meant something considerably less than practical activity as such: it meant merely *theoretical* practice, the intellectual lucubrations of the philosophers[9]. Thus Bruno Bauer wrote to Marx in 1841: "Theory is now the strongest *praxis* and we cannot say in advance to what extent it will become practical"[10]. And about the same time Marx himself was writing that, although philosophy "directs itself against the exterior reality of the world," it remains the case that "the *praxis* of philosophy is itself theoretical"[11]. At this date Marx was still well within the confines of the subjectivist, theoreticist view of praxis common to the Young Hegelians as a whole[12].

Marx's first break with this theoreticist view of praxis comes in his 'Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right', written probably in late 1843 and published the following year. In this essay, Marx stresses that "the criticism of the speculative philosophy of law does not develop in itself"—i.e. merely within its own sphere of theory—"but in terms of *tasks* (*Aufgaben*), for whose solution there is only one means: *praxis*"[13]. Here it seems clear that by 'praxis' is meant not mere cerebration but concrete activity. Marx underlines this point epigrammatically: "The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, supplant the criticism of weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force. However, theory too becomes a material force when it grips the masses"[14]. Marx also takes here a definite stand on the question of *whose* praxis will carry out this "criticism of weapons": he names for the first time the proletariat as the revolutionary class.

Already, then, Marx is embarked on the road which leads to the works containing his major critiques of Young Hegelian theoreticism: *The Holy Family* (written late 1844) and *The German Ideology* (1845-46). One quotation will make clear the thrust of his criticism: "Since the Young Hegelians consider conceptions, thoughts, ideas, in fact all the products of consciousness, to which they attribute independent existence, as the real chains of men (just as the Old Hegelians declared them the true bonds of human society) it is evident that the Young Hegelians have to"—Marx means: *see themselves* as having to —"fight only against the illusions of consciousness. This demand to change consciousness amounts to a demand to interpret reality in another way, i.e. to recognise it by means of another interpretation"[15].

The Young Hegelians, then, want to overthrow 'material force' by the 'weapon of criticism' alone. They want to change the social world but, since they consider ideas the bonds of the social world (that is: since they consider social relations as merely theoretical or ideological relations rather than as

[7] Hegel, "The German Constitution", in *Hegel's Political Writings*, Oxford, 1964, pp. 145 and 241.

[8] The term "praxis" was introduced by August von Cieskowski in 1838; there is no evidence that Marx read the relevant work by Cieskowski, and Cieskowski appears to have influenced him indirectly via the writings of Moses Hess. For discussions of Cieskowski see Lobkowicz, *op. cit.*, ch. 13, and Benoit P. Hepner, "History and the Future: The Vision of August Cieskowski", *Review of Politics*, July 1963.

[9] However Lobkowicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 235 and 274, cites passages from Edgar and Bruno Bauer which anticipate Marx's more activist views. (I would stress that in this paper I am unable to do justice to the views of individual Young Hegelians, and can deal only with the whole school as seen through the eyes of Marx.)

[10] Cited in David McLellan, *Marx before Marxism*, Penguin Books, p. 90.

[11] Marx, Notes to his Dissertation, *Early Texts*, ed. cit., p. 15.

[12] This theoreticist view of practice is to be found in Hegel himself, See his letter to Niethammer, October 28, 1808 (cited in Walter Kaufmann, *Hegel*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966, p. 323): "Theoretical work . . . accomplishes more in the world than practical work; once the realm of notions is revolutionised, actuality does not hold out. . . ."

[13] *Early Texts*, p. 122 (translation altered).

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 122-23 (translation altered).

[15] Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, p. 30.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relations of agency or of production), they finish up by changing not the world itself but only their interpretation of the world. Their conception of practice remains theoreticist: they view theory as the only true practice and so are led to substitute cultural action by an intellectual élite for the political action of classes. Already *in nuce* in 1843, and now explicitly, we meet the imperative of the famous last Thesis on Feuerbach (written early 1845): "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point is to *change* it."

This concludes our sketch of the development of Marx's views on theory and practice: from here on, discussion must be thematic rather than chronological. The *Theses on Feuerbach* which are, indeed, the *locus classicus* for Marx's views on our subject, provide a convenient base-line for discussion as we try to catch some of the hares set running in the chronological account.

THE RELATION OF THEORY TO PRACTICE

Central to the Marxist account of the relation of theory to practice is a view of man as an *agent* or actor, as *one who practices*. For Marx man *is* man only *as* an agent, and anyone whose agency is impeded or inhibited is by that token less than fully human. In *The German Ideology* the point is underlined in a neat play on words: Marx speaks of "real, active men" and the German phrase—*die wirklichen, wirkenden Menschen*—suggests that the two adjectives amount to the same thing[16]. From this view of man as agent there follows (a) the need to distinguish theory *from* practice, and (b) the requirement that theory must nevertheless be seen as included or involved *in* practice. We shall look at each of these points in turn.

(a) The Distinction between Theory and Practice

If man is an agent, then (in Marx's phrase) the "theoretical attitude" is not "the only human attitude"—*pace* the Young Hegelians. Rather, human activity is "*objective* activity"[17] and as such takes place in a world not merely of concepts but of objects. If action took place in a world merely of concepts or ideas then it would be an affair of—as it were—treading air. Since man is an agent he is to be regarded as existing in a world which is not merely thinkable but in the most literal sense tangible.

Thus the view of man as an agent implies a distinction between what can be changed through *theorising* on its own (ones ideas, ones 'interpretation' of the world) and what can be changed only through *practice* (the 'world' itself). This simple concept/object distinction is, I suggest, the basis of Marx's materialism[18]. It is what marks him off from Hegel and the Young Hegelians, in whose idealist problematic this distinction finds no place. Marx's materialism, then, goes hand in hand with the distinction between theory and practice, and like it is a corollary of his view of man as agent.

What makes Marx's materialism and his theory/practice distinction of particular interest is his application of them to the question of how changes can be made in men's social relations. While the Young Hegelians—and, in common with them, contemporary Frankfurt School Marxism—tend to regard social relations as changeable by theoretical or cultural action (e.g. philosophical essay-writing) on its own, Marx regards them as changeable only by (political) action. Viewing man as an agent, Marx regards social relations as not merely cultural or ideological relations, relations of thought, but as relations of agency or practice[19]. They engage man not merely *qua* thinker but in his life-activity, his "mode of life"[20] as a whole: Marx stresses this point in characterising social relations as *relations of production*. Thus men's social relations belong in the realm of 'objects' rather than 'concepts', and perhaps for this reason Marx describes them as "independent of their will"[21]. Social relations can be changed not by theory alone but only by practice.

Further, if man is an agent then it is, once more, not theory alone but practice which effects changes in *his own nature*. Thus Marx says that in economic practice man, by "acting on the external world and changing it", "at the same time changes his own nature"[22]; and he envisages revolutionary political practice as "the coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing"[23].

---

[16] See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, Band 3, p. 26.

[17] —*gegenständliche Tatigkeit* (*Theses on Feuerbach*, I).

[18] Kant makes the same distinction when, in criticising the ontological proof of the existence of God, he stresses the very real difference between "a hundred real thalers" and "the mere concept of them" (Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. by N. Kemp Smith, p. 505). It is interesting that Marx, while in his Young Hegelian phase, agreed with Hegel in rejecting Kant's refutation of the ontological argument (see Marx, *Early Texts*, p. 18).

[19] The point that social relations are not reducible to cultural or ideological relations is stressed by Lucio Colletti: see his *From Rousseau to Lenin*, NLB, 1972, pp. 14 and 44.

[20] *The German Ideology*, p. 32.

[21] Marx, 1859 Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.

[22] *Capital*, Vol. I, Allen & Unwin, 1957, p. 157.

[23] *Theses on Feuerbach*, III; see also *The German Ideology*, p. 234.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(b) **The Involvement of Theory in Practice**

What may be called a 'teleological moment'—an element of being (within limits) freely willed in the light of the agent's own aims and purposes—is a necessary aspect of agency. Without such a teleological moment agency becomes mere animal or mechanical 'action' (the 'action', say of one object upon another) and so becomes indistinguishable from an externally-caused natural occurrence or event. Hence theory—and theory, moreover, as a guide to practice—is essential to practice itself. Theory is involved or included in practice in the sense that the concept of practice contains within itself a *reference to* theory; similarly, any concrete instance of practice, in order to *be* such, must contain within itself a teleological or theoretical moment. If Marx's materialism is, as was said above, a corollary of his view of man as agent, we can now add the rider that this materialism entails no commitment whatever to mechanistic determinism.

It is worth stressing that what is being proposed here is *not* that theory is a kind or 'species' of practice (viz., 'theoretical' practice); such a view would in fact be inconsistent with the materialist distinction between theory and practice discussed above. Rather, the suggestion is that theory is itself one of practice's essential features. Of course, *pace* the idealists, theory is not the *only* essential feature of practice; but it is *one* such feature. Theory is not one kind of practice among others; rather, it is a necessary aspect of all practice or agency as such. In Hegelian terms, practice is the (complete) 'totality' of which theory is an (incomplete) 'moment'.

It seems clear that Marx recognises this teleological moment in practice[24], and also that he sees practice in this theory-inclusive way. In his 1843 'Introduction' he is clear that, while revolution cannot be effected by theory alone, nevertheless revolutionary practice must involve or include theory: the "head" of human emancipation is philosophy and "its heart is the proletariat"; "As philosophy finds in the proletariat its material weapons, so the proletariat finds in philosophy its intellectual weapons"[25]. Admittedly, in 1843-44 Marx still sees the unity of theory and practice within revolutionary practice in terms of an alliance between two distinct social groups, the intelligentsia and the proletariat. But this should not mislead us: in 1845 we find Marx criticising Feuerbach for having an over-narrow view of practice and for not having grasped "the significance of 'revolutionary', of 'practical-critical' activity"[26]. The phrase " practical-critical' activity" (*der 'praktischen-kritischen' Tätigkeit*) strongly suggests that Marx is here including theory *in* practice, as one of practice's moments or aspects.

Seeing the relation between theory and practice in this light, Marx does not set theory over against practice and ask us to choose between them. Since practice is theory-inclusive, we are in no sense rejecting or denigrating theory when we turn to practice. Thus Marx criticises not only the "theoretical party" (the Young Hegelians) but also the "practical party" who believe that they can abolish philosophy simply by "turning their back" on it and "without realising it" in practice[27]. This point, which leads on to Marxism's rejection of political 'spontaneism', will concern us below.

TWO DISTORTIONS OF MARXISM

Some flesh can be put on the bones of our comments so far by considering their implications for two diametrically opposed distortions of Marxism, 'mechanistic materialism' and 'historicism'.

Mechanistic Materialism

Mechanistic materialism is the view that there is no such thing as choice, that every natural, social and psychological event is causally determined by external conditions from which it must inevitably result. From our point of view, this position can be seen to turn on a *reduction of theory to practice* (just as, conversely, the Young Hegelians reduced practice to theory). Instead of grasping theory as a moment *in* practice, mechanistic materialism reduces theory *to* practice—and in so doing degrades practice itself to the level of a mere natural occurrence or event. For, if theory is a moment in practice, the reduction of theory to practice can mean only a reduction of practice to a part of itself (i.e. to that part which is 'left' after theory is removed). Thus the teleological moment, theory itself, is excluded from practice; theory's reduction to practice and its exclusion from practice, the counterposing of theory to practice, go hand in hand.

Marx repudiates mechanistic determinism[28] and also points out how the exclusion of theory from practice (as "contemplation") leads to an impoverished conception of practice itself[29].

[24] See his discussion of the labour-process in *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 157, where the "teleological moment" is specifically stressed; Engels likewise stresses it when, in *The Holy Family* (Moscow, 1956, p. 125), he describes history as "*nothing but* the activity of man pursuing his aims".

[25] Marx, *Early Texts*, pp. 128-29.

[26] *Theses on Feuerbach* I.,

[27] Marx, *Early Texts*, p. 121

[28] *Theses on Feuerbach*, III.

[29] In *Theses on Feuerbach*, I, Marx criticises Feuerbach for conceiving of practice "only in its dirty-judaical (*schmutzig judischen*) manifestation."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The failing of mechanistic materialism is that instead of grasping the theory/practice distinction as an asymetrical one, one term of the distinction (theory) being an aspect of the other (practice), it sees it as a distinction between two mutually exclusive realms. Similarly, if materialism is understood—as Engels understands it—in terms not of theory and practice but of a distinction between "thinking" and "being"[30], then the way is open to mechanistic distortions. For while practice may be interpreted, as Marx does, so as not to exclude theory, *being* on the contrary does exclude *thought*. While Engels himself was careful to avoid mechanistic reductionism[31], it is undeniable that he paved the way for vulgar Marxists less cautious than he was himself.

Historicism

Historicism is a 'tendency' in Marxism which, strikingly exemplified in Lukács and Gramsci[32], emphasises the activist elements in Marxian thought. It stresses Marx's affinity with Hegel while at the same time (though this is true only with substantial reservations for Lukács himself) playing down Hegel's rationalism, The most powerful critic of historicism is Althusser[33] and, as we shall see, Althusser identifies some real weaknesses when he charges historicism with reductionism and with a tendency towards spontaneism and denigration of theory. It is noteworthy that much 'humanist' Marxism rests on historicist foundations; though I shall argue that, *pace* Althusser, humanism need not (and indeed cannot) be based on historicism.

Like mechanistic materialism, historicism reduces theory to practice. But instead of doing this by excluding theory from practice and so impoverishing practice itself, historicism's programme is to attribute all the properties of theory *directly to practice*. To act, then, is to think; and action is regarded as being meaningful and creative not in virtue of being *guided* by thought, but directly and immediately in itself. Instead of speaking, as Marx himself does, of a dialectic of *concepts* in scientific theory, historicism's key belief is in a *dialectic of action*. Moreover, since action is itself meaningful, since to act *is* to think, historicism adds that the less action is trammelled with conscious forethought the better. Thus, as with mechanistic materialism, theory is finally excluded from practice; in this case, however, the result is pure activism and the cult of spontaneity[34].

Historicism's most attractive feature is its promise to acquit Marxism of the charge of historical determinism. Its denigration of theory, however, prevents it from making good this claim. This can be seen in the following characteristic passage from Rosa Luxemburg:

> "In general, the tactical policy of the social democracy is not something that may be 'invented'. It is the product of a series of great creative acts of the often spontaneous class struggle seeking its way forward. The unconscious comes before the conscious. The logic of the historic process comes before the subjective logic of the human beings who participate in the historic process. The tendency is for the directing organs of the socialist party to play a conservative role"[35].

The cult of spontaneity leads, then, to a stress on the objective or unconscious 'logic of the historic process' as deterministic as anything in mechanistic materialism. Indeed, historicism and mechanistic materialism are both deterministic for the same reason, viz., that they have no conception of theory as a guide to practice.

UNITY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

We turn now to more positive points arising from our earlier account of the relation between theory and practice. Practice, we said, in a sense 'includes' theory. But is *all* theory in this manner a moment in practice? What about so-called 'pure' theory—philosophy itself, for example?

Marx, I suggest, holds that all theory is in fact a moment in practice in the sense discussed above, "Consciousness can never be anything else than

[30] Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, Moscow, 1969, p. 19ff.

[31] See, for example, his late letters to Bloch, Schmidt and Starkenberg; and also his stress on "practice" in his general epistemology.

[32] Gramsci describes Marxism as "absolute 'historicism' ", adding that it is "an absolute humanism of history" (*Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1971, p. 465).

[33] See especially Althusser, *Reading Capital*, NLB, 1970, Ch. 5. (It will be seen that my understanding of how historicism is reductionist differs from Althusser's. Althusser accuses historicism of reducing discrete—economic, political, ideological, theoretical—"practices" to one homogeneous "praxis"; but it seems to me that calling theory itself a "practice" blurs the materialist distinction between theory and practice, and that historicism reduces not *practices* to *praxis* but, rather, *theory* to *practice*, thus arriving at an impoverished conception of practice itself.)

[34] I would emphasise that this is a position which historicism *tends towards*—often in spite of itself. Certainly neither Lukacs nor Gramsci consciously advocate this position. As with the Young Hegelians, my account of historicism cannot do justice to individuals and to that extent sets up a "straw man".

[35] Rosa Luxemburg, "Organisational Questions of the Russian Social Democracy" in Mary-Alice Waters, ed., *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks*, Pathfinder Press, 1970, p. 121.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual life-process"[36]. There is no such thing, then, as 'pure' theory, if by this is meant theory which, descending from the clouds (or from a Platonic heaven), carries with it no implications for practical life. Theory essentially and intrinsically is—it is its nature to be—a moment in practical life, growing out of past practice and (consciously or unconsciously) informing practice in the future[37].

The basis for this position is, once more, the view of man as agent: all thought is the thought of some agent, the theory of his practice. All thought is the *ideology* of some agent and, moreover, can only fully be understood *as* that agent's ideology, as a moment in his social practice[38]. This is so whether or not the agent is himself aware of his thought as springing from his past practice; whether or not (if he is aware of this) he successfully incorporates this awareness into his thought's conceptual structure; and whether or not he intends his thought as a guide to his practice in the future. In all cases, the "this-sidedness" (*Dies-seitigkeit*) of his thought emerges in his practice[39].

If all thought is in this way practice-related, then it follows that, strictly, there is no such thing as the *separation* of theory and practice. Rather, there are only *more or less adequate forms of the unity* of theory and practice. Thought which is not aware of itself as a moment of practice (i.e. thought which is not aware of its social nature) has an inadequate form of unity with practice and may be characterised as *false consciousness*. Thought which on the contrary is aware of itself as practice-related, and which successfully incorporates this awareness in its conceptual structure, has an adequate form of unity with practice and may be characterised as *true consciousness* or dialectical *science*.

Science and False Consciousness

Science, on this view, is ideology which is aware of its own nature *as* ideology: it is, in a word, the self-consciousness of practice. Hegel, too, regards science as self-conscious. But whereas, for him, thought is self-conscious when it appears self-sufficient and dependent on nothing outside of itself, for Marx thought is self-conscious precisely when it abandons such illusions of self-sufficiency and recognises itself as rooted in practice.

As practice's self-consciousness, science provides a standpoint from which a critique of false consciousness may be undertaken. In general terms, what this critique involves is the bringing of theory into conscious and explicit relation with the practice of which it is a moment. It articulates the already present, but hitherto concealed, connection between theory and practice and so confronts false consciousness with a better understanding of its own nature than it has itself. Thought which is unconscious of its relation to practice deals, says Marx, in "mysteries"; and "All mysteries which lead theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human practice *and in the comprehension of this practice*"[40].

Once again, the Young Hegelians provide us with an example of false consciousness, and Marx indicts them as follows: "It has not occurred to any one of these philosophers to inquire into the connection of German philosophy with German reality, the relation of their criticism to their own material surroundings"[41]. Unconscious of the roots of their theory in their own (past) practice, they have no conception of how theory can attain practical effectiveness as a guide to (future) practice. Their 'radical' theorising merely recognises existing reality by means of another interpretation of it—and so has if anything a conservative and apologetic effect[42]. Failing to pose the problem of *whose* agency will 'realise' theory, they regard society not as a sphere of agency but as comprising a passive and inert "mass"[43]. We have already seen that it is in the essay where Marx registers his break with Young Hegelianism that he puts forward the conception of the proletariat as the revolutionary class.

A further point should be noted in connection with the critique of false consciousness. If false consciousness can only be comprehended by bringing it into explicit relation with its practice, it follows that such a critique takes as its *object* not merely the (falsely conscious) theory but the practice in which that theory is included. Its object, that is to say, is not in the narrow sense philosophical but, rather, socio-historical. Marx makes this point in the fourth of the *Theses on Feuerbach*; it is an

[36] *The German Ideology*, p. 37.

[37] On the analogy of Marx's schema for exchange and reproduction in *Capital*, where the cycle of Money-Commodity-Money is written M-C-M, the twofold relation of theory to past and future practice might be expressed in the formula P-T-P.

[38] The paragraphs which follow develop points I made in "Marxism and Dialectical Method", *Marxism Today*, July 1973.

[39] *Theses on Feuerbach*, II.

[40] *Ibid.*, VIII. (my emphasis).

[41] *The German Ideology*, p. 31.

[42] See Note 15, above. As regards conservatism, Marx (for example) points out that behind the storm and stress of Stirner's "Association of Egoists" the mundane outline of the German Customs Union can be discerned (*The German Ideology*, p. 462).

[43] See *The Holy Family*, pp. 105-17 (' "Spirit" and "Mass" ').

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important point, since it helps to explain how his interest shifted from the overtly philosophical concerns of his early works to the social theory which absorbed him later on.

MARX'S HUMANISM

At the start of this paper it was suggested that an understanding of the relation of theory to practice might shed light on the sense in which Marx can be called a humanist. We can now approach this problem in the light of what has been said, above, about historicism and the Marxist conception of science.

Theory which is unconscious of its roots in past practice is likely to be unable to function as a conscious guide to future practice: we have seen this point exemplified in Young Hegelianism, but it will be useful to look more closely at what is involved. As already said, such theory will in any case influence future practice but it will not do so consciously and explicitly. False consciousness is the spontaneous product of past practice, past practice's immediate 'reflection', but it does not yet *comprehend* past practice nor is it a conscious guide to future practice. Only when it comprehends past practice (and itself as a moment of past practice) can it serve as a guide, in the full sense, to future practice; conversely, any thought which does fully comprehend the practice from which it springs is by that token capable of serving as a guide to action. (Here Marxism departs from Hegel, who, as we saw, regards theory as comprehending past practice but as unable to guide future practice. On our view, if theory can do the former it can do the latter too.)

Scientific Thought

Basically, what is lacking in false consciousness is a dimension of *self-criticism*. Scientific thought, being conscious of its relation to past practice, can consider this relation critically and can therefore rise above the status of being merely past practice's spontaneous expression or immediate reflection. It can consider critically its own terms of reference, which are the immediate, given reflection of past practice; and it can go on to formulate new terms adequate to some consciously chosen project in the future. This critical dimension seems essential to the very notion of scientific thought[44].

No thought which merely uncritically accepts itself as it 'finds' itself, i.e. as the immediate, spontaneous expression of past practice, can properly be described as scientific[45]. Science is more than the 'simple reproduction' of already existing forms of thought and action. Here we come once again to the weakness of mechanistic materialism and historicism alike: each in its different way regards theory merely as an expression of past practice. Neither view can grasp theory as a guide to action and hence as *science*, that is, as the adequate self-consciousness of a human being who is in the full sense an agent.

Practice which is guided by, which flows from, scientific thought will be not merely an unchanged simple reproduction of past practice but, rather, something qualitatively new[46]. Practice which flows from false consciousness, on the other hand, will be merely a perpetuation of a past state of affairs—since the theory on which it is premised is merely, as we have seen, a direct and uncomprehending reflection of previous practice. Using Marx's own terms, we can express the contrast between these two sorts of practice by saying that the former is distinctively *human* practice while the latter is merely *animal*. Now historicism, viewing theory as the spontaneous product of past practice, cannot provide a basis for Marxian humanism since a conception of—in this sense—fully human practice or agency, of practice guided by scientific theory, lies beyond its grasp.

The Human/Animal Contrast

This human/animal contrast, as developed by Marx, tells us a good deal about how his humanism is bound up with his conception of theory and practice. A closer look at it will help to clarify the nature of his humanism itself.

In *The German Ideology* Marx says that men "begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to *produce* their means of life (*Lebensmittel*). . . . By producing their means of life men are indirectly producing their material life" itself[47]. This self-production is at the same time self-

[44] This is one of the positive insights of the Frankfurt School.

[45] In this connection is it worth registering a protest against any assimilation of Marxist epistemology to reflectionism or naive realism; any such assimilation rests on a failure to grasp the sense in which Marxism claims to be "scientific". Marx's attitude to vulgar political economy, which "deals with appearances only" (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 53n.) and copies down those appearances as they are reflected in the brains of the capitalists, should be warning enough.

[46] In the terminology of Note 37, above, the formula for practice flowing from scientific theory, i.e. for *human* practice, would be P-T-P' (that is: Practice-Theory-Practice+increment). The analogy is with Marx's formula for extended or capitalist production: M-C-M'.

[47] *The German Ideology*, p. 31 (translation altered).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development: the satisfaction of need, says Marx, "leads to new needs; and this production of new needs is the first historical (i.e. human or 'species') act"[48]. In *Capital* he makes the same point: by acting on the external world and changing it, man "at the same time changes his own nature. He develops his slumbering powers and compels them to act in obedience to his sway. We are not now dealing with those primitive, instinctive forms of labour that remind us of the mere animal," but with human labour which is consciously undertaken with a definite purpose[49]. In a parallel passage in the 1844 *Manuscripts*, Marx says that the animal "produces one-sidedly, whilst man produces universally"; "The animal is immediately identical with his life-activity. It does not distinguish himself from it. . . . Man makes his life-activity the object of his will and of his consciousness. He has conscious life-activity"[50].

Thus while animal consciousness is a mere immediate reflection *of* its life-activity, human consciousness involves mediated reflection *on* practice. It is the peculiarity of human practice to be undertaken with some consciously-chosen end in view (the 'teleological moment' referred to earlier), i.e. to be consciously guided by theory. Precisely because of this, human practice is developmental (and self-developmental): its result is the production of some new state of affairs and not merely the reproduction of some old one. Human activity is open-ended in a way which animal action is not, and it is (or can be) so because it includes or involves theory—which, as self-consciousness or science, can formulate new projects and guide practice into fresh channels, Animal practice merely repeats time and again the same changes in its environment; it forms a closed cycle or 'circle' while human practice forms an open 'spiral'. Animal action is simple reproduction while human action is extended reproduction or *pro*duction proper. In the *Grundrisse* Marx envisages, as truly human, production which is not "measured against any already established yardstick", in which "man does not reproduce himself in a determined form," where he "does not seek to remain something he has become, but is in the absolute movement of his becoming"[51]. It follows that it is only human, and not animal, practice that can in any meaningful sense be called free.

In the Tradition of Rationalist Humanism

Marx's characterisation of 'human' practice serves to draw together the themes of this paper and also to clarify the nature of his humanism. For the theme, implicit in Marx's view, of man alone being able to break out of the confines of natural necessity through a free development of his powers is a traditional one in Western thought. Marx's development of this theme, and his stress on the role of theory as a guide to practice, place him firmly in a tradition of rationalist humanism which stretches back through Hegel and the Enlightenment to the earlier rationalist philosophers of the 'scientific revolution' which was one of the fruits of the Renaissance. We can say that Marx's enthusiasm for this theme was a constant throughout his life; it can be found not only in his mature theoretical works but in his student fascination with the Prometheus legend[52] and, earlier still, in one of his school-leaving essays[53]. It is one of the ironies of the development of Marxist theory that Marx's humanism has come to be associated, not with the capacity of rational theory to guide free practice, but with a subjective spontaneism which tends towards the rejection of theory altogether.

A consideration of the concepts of theory and practice in Marxist thought is of value if it shows, at least, that Marx's humanism is not to be sought among the concepts of historicism. The Althusserian equation of humanism with historicism does not stand. Rather, Marx's humanism is rationalist in character; his philosophical achievement was, precisely, to bind rationalism and humanism together by showing how theory is a real and vital element in human practice.

---

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[49] *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 157 (this is the passage containing the famous comparison between the spider and the weaver, and the bee and the architect; Hegel makes a similar point, with the same example of "bees building their cells", in the *Phenomenology of Mind*, ed. cit., p. 704).

[50] Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow, 1967, p. 71.

[51] David McLellan, *Marx's Grundrisse*, Paladin, 1973, p. 139 (see p. 488 of the Penguin edition for the same passage).

[52] In the Preface to his Dissertation Marx declared that "Prometheus is the foremost saint and martyr in the philosopher's calendar" (*Early Texts*, p. 14).

[53] Marx, "Reflections of a Youth on Choosing an Occupation" (in Easton and Guddat, eds., *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*, Doubleday Anchor, 1967, p. 35): "Nature has assigned to the animal the sphere of its activity, and the animal acts calmly within it, not striving beyond, not even surmising that there is another. To man, too, the Deity gave a general goal, to improve mankind and himself, but it left it up to him to choose the position in society which is most appropriate and from which he can best elevate both himself and society."

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London WC2E 8HY, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.—25802

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

announcing a major publishing event by Lawrence & Wishart

MARX AND ENGELS COLLECTED WORKS

The definitive English language edition, in 50 volumes, will begin publication with Volume One on 10th January, followed by Volume Two in the Spring and Volume Three in the summer. Thereafter, volumes will appear at a rate of about four a year. The price is £3 per volume.

VOLUME ONE MARX 1835-1843

The earliest writings of Marx, including his schoolboy letters and essays, the Doctoral Dissertation on early Greek Philosophy with his accompanying post-graduate notebooks, poems and journalistic writings. These are of immense interest in their own right, and as indicative of the first stages of Marx's intellectual and political development.

VOLUME TWO ENGELS 1838-1842

The earliest writings by Engels, including family and other letters, journalism, poems, and the philosophical pamphlets published in Berlin against Schelling and in defence of Hegel. Some of the letters are illustrated by caricatures and sketches drawn by Engels.

order now

LAWRENCE & WISHART
46 BEDFORD ROW
LONDON WC1B 4LR

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: 1974
No. 12

THE DETENTE AND THE CONFRONTATION OF IDEAS
B. Suika

REGIME WITHOUT A FUTURE (CHILE)
C. Cuadra

DEAD ENDS OF NEO COLONIALISM
J. Suret-Canal

Price: 15p per issue plus postage
£1.80 for one year
from

CENTRAL BOOKS LIMITED
37 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8PS

A Comprehensive Survey of Childcare Facilities

Articles covering:

* Attitudes to child care over the last century.
* Communist Policy on Child Care Provision.
* Sociological Theories.
* Nursery Education * Playgroups.
* Student Nurseries. * Childminders.
* Community Children's Centre.

All in 'LINK'—Communist Party Women's journal. Winter 1974 issue—Now on sale—Price 10p.

Order from: **Central Books**

37 Grays Inn Road, WC1X 8PS (subscription 70p per annum), or from:

Women's Dept., Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.

**37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, WC1X 8PS**

THE USSR IN FIGURES FOR 1973

224 pages paper 60p

THE OCTOBER STORM AND AFTER

354 pages 14 photos cloth £1.25

THE NEW SCRAMBLE FOR AFRICA

by E. A. Tarabrin

This book examines inter-imperialist contradictions in the developing countries of Africa as part of the complex system of co-operation and rivalry between the Western powers in the Third World.

349 pages cloth £1.25

SOCIALISM AND THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT NATIONS

by R. Ulyanovsky

This deals with the history of the socialist conception of a united front of the international working class, communist movement and national liberation struggle. It examines basic problems facing newly independent states—agragian and peasant questions, the establishment of the state sector and theoretical aspects of the non-capitalist path of development.

562 pages cloth £1.50

WEST BERLIN

by V. Vysotsky

355 pages cloth £1.0

USA: MILITARISM AND THE ECONOMY

by R. A. Faramazyan

271 pages cloth 90p

OPTIMAL FUNCTIONING SYSTEM FOR A SOCIALIST ECONOMY

by N. P. Fedorenko

189 pages cloth 75p

Communist Party Pamphlets

Marxism and the Family

(Selected contributions from *Marxism Today* discussion)

25p

Class Structure

(Selected contributions from *Marxism Today* discussion)

25p

COMMENT

***Comment* is the Communist Party's fortnightly paper.**
***Comment* is a news review and comment upon current affairs.**
***Comment* provides background information and facts on problems, peoples, parties and policies at home and overseas.**
***Comment* carries the principal statements of the British Communist Party and information about the Party's work. It tells you what the Communist, Socialist and progressive movement is doing throughout the world. Its articles explain the theory of socialism and the way of advance to socialism in Britain.**

Price 10p. Order from Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8PS or usual agents.

Subscription £3.80—1 year
£2.00—6 months (UK only)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED